Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 58 ST. LOUIS, MO. MARCH 1930

THE ROAD OF HIS HUMANITY

By F. C. Hoggarth—England

(Received through J. H. Horstmann)

I.

A Sunday school teacher said in my hearing recently that not for some years had he taken any lesson from the Gospels. By preference he turned to Paul's life and letters, for Paul, he said, seemed a more virile and humane hero than Jesus. Certainly a curious judgment for one who rather boasted on his old-fashioned orthodoxy! Christ of course he worshipped as his Saviour, but when he wanted lessons for boys Paul seemed of greater service! Jesus, as he understood the record, fell back on his divinity from time to time. He instanced the scene at Nazareth, on the day that Jesus aroused the hatred of his neighbors. "They cast him forth," we read, "and led him to the brow of the hill, that they might throw him down headlong. But he, passing through the midst of them, went his way." His interpretation of that scene was that Jesus fell back on miraculous power to effect an escape, that by levitation he floated through the air, or that he became invisible, vanishing from their sight. Paul of course had no such ways of escape and so appeared the more inspiring figure.

To this teacher Christ was a mere official figure, as Dr. Cairns says he became to many Christians after the Reformation. And such a view is not even yet uncommon in spite of the new emphasis on the Jesus of history. It may not be quite so openly stated as in the case under review, but it seems to be in the background of many minds and results in people discounting the humanity of

Jesus and in a real weakening of the appeal of Jesus. For not a few the divinity of Jesus seems to rob his humanity of any real significance.

II.

Such a view of Jesus is a caricature, quite wide of the facts. It springs out of careless presuppositions as to what happened. In the case of Christ's escape from the crowd, there is no need to introduce any "Miraculous element" to account for his escape. The personality of Jesus would seem to be quite a sufficient explanation. There was that about him that greatly impressed and awed men. The crowd, susceptible to sudden moods and fears, probably divided in itself; as to its purpose, more than likely grew hesitant or turned to disputing, which gave Jesus his opportunity. The author of "By an Unknown Disciple" simply suggests that Jesus slipped away by a back path and escaped.

Behind the caricature lies a wrong way of approach. To begin with the divinity of Jesus, or rather with some vague and widely mistaken idea of what "divinity" means, and then to introduce it as a sort of deus ex machina, at what seems suitable points in the narrative, is to get almost hopelessly astray.

In most subjects, the way of approach is vital, and nowhere more so than in this subject. To find the right way of approach makes all the difference. Suso, the 14th century mystic, takes us to the heart of the subject, in his great saying,—he is speaking of Jesus—"My humanity is the road by which men must travel." Our first need is to discover the Jesus of history, to see him, as accurately as may be, as the disciples saw him.

III

Children certainly need the humanity of Jesus. They must be shown the charm, the love, the daring, the gaiety of that life. Nor must they even be taught that Jesus used miraculous power to help him escape from threatening situations. Such an assumption, even at the back of the teacher's mind, will be felt by scholars, with fatal results. "At once a child feels that Jesus had an unfair advantage. It begins to discount the words and experiences of Jesus. Hero-worship, perhaps the strongest of all our appeals to boy and girl, is hardly possible, unless the hero is genuinely human, and "tempted in all points like as we are."—There must be no doubt about the genuine humanity of Jesus in a child's mind. That is the first thing to make sure of. That should be our starting point—the man Jesus.

It was there, of course, that the disciples began. They were first of all fascinated by a personality. They left their nets or the

seat of custom because the man Jesus had won their hearts. He called, they followed. The road they took was one of manifold discovery. They discovered their own weakness, their inability to follow, or to do more than follow afar off and to fear as they followed. They discovered his power. They came to see in him more than a man. But they began with the genuinely human figure, with the man who ate and walked and laughed with them.

They began, too, at Nazareth, not at Calvary. Their Pilgrim's Progress was very different from the classic Progress of Bunyan's Christian. They certainly did not start from any City of Destruction, nor was their dominant motive fear.

V.

Whatever may be true of other ages, Nazareth seems the effective point of departure for our age. We have used Bunyan to ill purpose if we regard his Progress as the norm of Christian experience. His book is not the one official guide. It is the way by which one man came—the swearing, cursing tinker of Bedford in the 17th Century. As such it is of priceless worth, rich in structure and in manifold inspiration. But to seek to force the experience of the young people in Christian homes into this particular mould is to do injury to their souls. If the City of Destruction is the only effective point of departure and if it is desirable that they should reproduce the emotional symptoms of Bunyan's pilgrim, then we must first of all drive them into the far country to sow their wild oats like the Bedford prodigal. That is the last thing we desire, yet there are still those who seem to expect youth to reproduce the Bunyan kind of conversion without the Bunyan kind of ignorance and wickedness. To every child into whose hands the Pilgrim's Progress is put, something should be said about the "Varieties of Religious Experience" and the different ways into the Kingdom. For many never come, or only come after long wander years, through bewilderment at impossible experiences expected from them.

The *Road of his humanity* is the *way* by which *our boys* and *girls must travel.* Not Christ on the Cross to begin with,—not the official Saviour of much Reformation theology, but the human Jesus. The disciples, beginning at Nazareth and Capernaum, came in the end to Calvary, and so shall the young disciples of our day, but their beginnings are lower down the road.—

No stone should be left unturned to correct any false ideas of Jesus as a demi-god, who was never quite human, or at most only intermittantly so, who escaped through miraculous power when things grew uncomfortably threatening.—For nothing stands out

more impressively than that he did not escape. Whatever powers he might have had—he never called for them in his own behalf. The great message of the incarnation is that he became a man, accepted our human lot, became obedient to the conditions and laws of human life. And he accepted these limitations and disciplines loyally to the end.

VI.

In a book of Richard Whiting's, "Number Five John Street," the hero leaves congenial and luxurious surroundings to live in a city slum. He genuinely seeks to share the life of those doomed to live in the dismal, overcrowded and unsanitary areas of one of our English cities. He rents a garret dwelling, lives on a weekly pittance, but every now and then, when the life grows intolerable, when he has come to the limit of endurance, he escapes to his hotel. There he bathes, changes his raiment and dines. That escape, even the possibility of it,—for he always carried a cheque book in case of emergency, put a wide gulf between him and the slum dweller. The sting of real poverty is that there is *no* door of escape, however fierce the pressure, it must needs be faced to the bitterest end.—

The humanity of Jesus was not partial like Number Five John Street's adoption of poverty. "Though he was rich, he became poor" and the heart of the temptations of Jesus was that he should *fall back on his wealth.*—The story of the temptation, as we have it, is of course a spiritual struggle dramatized. It gives a glimpse of the background of Christ's life. As Fosdick says, "If he had not told us of the temptation to escape the consequences of Saviourhood, we might not have suspected its presence in his heart, for he paid the price so gladly, so fully, so unfalteringly." Yet there was the struggle, the loneliness, the persistence to the point of exhaustion. "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones become bread;" was one form of the temptation. The Son of God surely need not hunger! He should be able to escape from desperate situations of this kind!

VII.

How human is this suggestion of escape! Yet Jesus refuses. Though a Son, he hungers. Though a Son he suffers, learning obedience even by the things that he suffers. His own name for himself is Son of Man. On that he insists as though his humanity and his loyalty to its disciplines, obedience, and dependencies, to its "poverty," was a central factor in the situation. He knew the long lonely battle of the soul. He was *tempted.* And after all Fosdick says, "We can neither understand nor imitate a character that is not tempted. Something is lacking where such discipline

and trial and pain are absent." We must be at some pains to make this aspect of Christ's humanity *real* to youth; for to not a few it is lost in mists of unreality. Just because of these supposed resources on which he drew, thus finding escape, his temptation is to them unreal and so many have never found in it the succor and the inspiration they so deeply need.

VIII.

The value of the life and message of Jesus depends on the reality of the incarnation. To be afraid of his humanity is to take the heart out of the good news. For it makes all the difference to us, whether his words come from the heights above the battle or from the heart of the conflict. So many of the fine maxims of morality are dropped from such heights. "Then welcome each rebuff that makes earth's smoothness rough," urged Browning. Fine, challenging words they are. Yet the man who spoke them was "a well to do poet who lived in a charming palace on the Grand Canal at Venice."

Christ's words came from the heart of the conflict and of the sacrifice. "Be not anxious" he says. They are the words of a poor toiler, who probably had kept a widowed mother, and who at times "had not where to lay his head." They are the words of one whose path like ours was "amid encircling gloom." There was a real limitation of knowledge. He did not know the end from the beginning, "for that," as Talbot says, "would be to deny him the essential element of human faith and trust, which is that it has to step out *beyond the light of knowledge* into the darkness of uncertainty." Yet he was not anxious.

Once the man is seen living a real human experience his words grow luminous in a new way. To make the human personality of Jesus real is one of our first tasks and highest privileges. It is a chief need of our age and increasingly it appears as the only really effective appeal left to us. For our age has moved away from theologies and creeds. Old proofs no longer persuade, old authorities no longer hold as once they did. We are being driven back to the actual Jesus and he unfailingly appeals, once he is truly seen. And the power to make him stand out of the picture for others, largely depends upon our own vision of him. "To see him as he is," says Glover, "calls for all we have of intellect, of tenderness, of love and greatness."—Not the least of our sins has been the inadequate, superficial, casual conceptions of him in which we have rested.

IX.

To see him in the glory of his human personality means for most that we must become interested in him in a new sort of way.

For it seems only too true that we have not been very interested in him, not interested, for instance, in the way of a man who has adopted some study or activity as a serious interest. Such a man, as Mr. Kenneth Kirk says, "will read all available literature, buy every new book, search every source of information for further light on his subject. He may not often speak about his studies. . . but whenever he does allude to them, it is always to say something new about them. . . That is the real test of interest, that you should constantly be getting and shedding new light upon your subject. . . And judged by this test, the average Christian shows little interest in his Master."—Those are strong words. We must for ourselves judge of their truth. Certainly we must be interested ourselves in more than a casual way before we can kindle interest in others. It would be well to concentrate in all our schools on the central figure of the gospels, for a year or two making him the center of our reading, our thinking, our teaching—exploring the field together in groups throughout the churches. There is a whole harvest of seventy years' labor of Christian scholarship on the gospels, which has scarcely begun to reach our schools and our scholars. Never since the first century has the figure of Jesus stood out so clearly or in such unchallenged preeminence of power and of beauty. He will win the boys and girls if we show him and not some caricature of him to them. We must make it impossible for any child hereafter to say what the recent headmaster of Rugby has said about his own early religious training—that no representation of Jesus in picture or in stained glass ever once attracted or inspired him. If art cannot help us it must not be allowed to hinder us. If it cannot express those traits that so strongly appeal to youth, Christs' loyalty and heroism, his love of beauty and his strong manhood, we must see that thew are expressed, with no chance of misunderstanding. The road he gave our feet for the immediate years is the road of his humanity. That is the high calling to be worthy of which will claim our power to the uttermost.

THE MERGER OF KINDRED CHURCH BODIES*

(Evangelical Reformed)

THEO. WITTLINGER

Church Union is in the air; the thought of alining and uniting kindred church bodies has become quite the fashion. The Catholic Church is strong, mighty, able to further its plans, and it has a world-wide extension. The Protestant Churches, seemingly, are weak, divided, impotent to accomplish greater ends in the Kingdom of God, or in the realm of practical and social affairs. Modernism in leveling creeds and doctrines and in putting aside long-standing differences, has prepared the way to a closer approach of the churches. So the tendency toward Church Union is the outgrowth of modern ideas, sentiments and principles.

In the mission fields of the Protestant churches there is already a practical working union between the different churches. And because they have in common the essentials of Christianity: one Gospel, one faith, one Christ and one God, they believe in Christian intercourse, honoring and respecting each other, and each other's work. So the tendency toward Church Union is not 'unchristian,' but is in accordance with Christian ideas and principles. We all should be 'one' in Christ, as Christ is one with God.—

But it depends upon what basis and in what lines Church Union shall be established. If Church Union is primarily established on a material and financial basis, perhaps, to get out of a distressing and difficult situation, then it might be a failure.

An extended and enlarged organization is not identical with an intensified Christianity, but may just as well lead to greater worldliness. If Church Union is established in a vainglorious spirit, simply, perhaps, to make a contribution to American Protestantism, then the outcome would be disappointing. Church Union can only prosper and will be a blessing to its participants if it rests on a spiritual basis, if it means a stronger agency to establish the Kingdom of God on earth, if it gives us better means to save the souls of men from the thraldom of materialism, which pervades the people and lays waste the church.

The editor of the Theological Magazine (Sept. 1929, No. 5) says: "The greatest subject in the Agenda of the coming General Conference will doubtless be the merger plan with the Reformed Church and the United Brethren. It seems probable that nothing of an ultimate nature can be expected at this time. A union of our Synod with the Reformed (and perhaps, with the United

*Recommended for publication by Waterloo (Ill.) Pastoral Conference.

Brethren) would be along the lines of that recent development which looks to the consolidation of kindred groups in American Protestantism." Lately, the Lutherans have combined three formerly independent bodies in the United Lutheran Church; and in Canada Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists have founded the United Church of Canada. Now our Synod has cast a wistful eye toward these large and kindred churches and wishes to come in line with them, and also make a contribution to American Protestantism. According to the article "Will it be Luther or Calvin?" (March, 1928, number 2 of Magazine), our fathers did not make an "appreciable contribution to American Protestantism." In their religious modesty they did not want to impress the world "with numbers, the schools, the theology, the literature of the church, much less with its power in legislation and politics, that would have been utterly worldly to them." Were our fathers wrong in concentrating their efforts on religious life, and in inculcating religious truth into the hearts and minds of growing communities? They were not so desirous of impressing the world with what they were doing, although they did a great work, perhaps, a greater work than we are doing with all our emphasis on numbers, schools, theology, literature, legislation, politics, social service, etc.—If I see right, the church is primarily no social institution, but is essentially a religious institution. As a religious institution, as a creation of the spirit of Christ, it must lay the stress on faith. Christ laid the emphasis on faith, so did Paul and Luther. Through faith the church has grown and developed, and through faith it will live, and without faith all our stress on social service, all our contributions to American Protestantism will not keep it alive.—

Our Synod is more Lutheran than Reformed in spirit. For many years it has drawn water out of the deep wells of Luther's theology and piety. When the high waves of modernism assailed and seemingly undermined the foundations of faith, we could go back to the sound theology, to the deep religious insight and experiences of Martin Luther, and we were strengthened and fortified in faith. But a union with the Reformed church would not mean that we had to give up the Lutheran fervor and stress on faith, the 'Innerlichkeit' of Lutheran piety, the 'sola fide' which pervades Lutheran theology. The Calvinistic spirit which pervades the 'American churches,' and also the Reformed Church lays the "emphasis on life rather than on doctrines; on work more than on faith," and is more aggressive and assertive in public life. It seems plausible, that Lutheran introspection, searching the inner life of man, and Calvinistic tendency toward public life, society

and its ordinances, might supplement and enrich each other. Though there are differences in doctrine between the Lutheran and Reformed Church, both stand on common ground in having the same religious principle: Justification by faith.—

If the prospective merger will come to pass, the interesting question for us will not be so much one of doctrine as of church policy and church government. What changes will be made, and how will they effect the Evangelical church, its property and its members? What will become of the Synod, and on what basis, and in what lines will its work continue? Will it retain its freedom of action, its control over its own house, the management of its schools, missionfields, etc.? Or will the merger mean for us a loss of individuality in name and character, a partial submergence under the policies and regulations of another church? Will it merely mean interchurch help and a common policy as regards legislation, politics, social service, etc.

It is too early at this stage to surmise even what will happen.— One thing is certain, we need a rejuvenation in faith as well as in management. A spiritualization of the church, and also a better adjustment to sound business methods seems desirable. We sorely need an angel of Bethesda with healing power under its wings to stir the stagnant pool and bring new life into the church, and abolish chronic disease.—

The responsible persons entrusted with forming a possible merger will need much tact and wisdom not to barter away the inalienable rights of its members, and at the same time do all that can be done to spiritualize the church. The pattern in forming a merger will, in all likelihood, be found in the great American churches which have enacted mergers already. Just now the National Council of Congregational churches and the General Convention of the Christian Church, including 1,800,000 members, are uniting in merger. The combined denominations will be known as the General Council of Congregational and Christian churches. The merger permits members of both denominations to retain their respective beliefs and to develop their own forms of expressions, but the General Council will perform on behalf of both churches the functions formerly exercised by both governing bodies.

If in the prospective merger with the Reformed the spirit of egotism is eliminated and the spirit of faith and love pervades the churches, then the right forms will be found for a practical working union which may benefit both. Church Union works from within, its principle must be unity in spirit, in faith and in love. And if the initial plans and programs do not lead to a debacle, if time is given for the spirit of the church to work out its own forms

and expressions in beliefs and in organization, if the widest plasticity prevails in the unity of spirit, then Church Union may lead to a more effective and intensified Christianity. Common ideals, common needs, common work may knit the churches closer together, and the spirit of God can manifest itself in various forms. If all have the ardent will and desire to do God's work, to spiritualize the church, so that it may be a better means for saving the souls of men, then a merger, rightly guided and conducted, may be more powerful and effective toward the realization of this end.

RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES FOR MEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

H. L. Streich

"Too many churchmen's organizations are but social clubs," says a recent writer. This may be true of some Evangelical men's societies. But we are glad to say that the number is growing smaller year by year. Our men are accepting and promoting the Brotherhood program. It makes religious activities first and foremost.

The social side of men's life must, however, not be overlooked. Normal men are but grown boys. They love to play. And should stay normal and young. Social features must, therefore, have a proper place in men's work.

But after all, churchmen's organizations are organized for the promotion of the program of the church. This should not be forgotten. Strange to say this is not overlooked in women's work. But some pastors think we must not expect men to perform religious work, not even churchmen. So some men's societies are no different than men's clubs outside the church.

With other denominations we are, however, finding that churchmen do respond to religious programs and enlist in the various activities of the church. The writer meets each year with the Interdenominational Council on Men's Work, of which he is vice-president, made up of over twelve communions. At these meetings all report the increased activity of their men in definite church work. Among the most common are the following activities: Personal and Visitation Evangelism, Bible Study, Family Devotions, Boys' Work, Christian Stewardship, Men's Retreats, Church Attendance, Missions, Social Service, Race Relations and World Peace. These objectives are being presented and promoted by the men's organizations of all the larger denominations. We are glad to say that these have been our objectives also. Churches and pastors, therefore, make a mistake if they fail to adopt these phases of activities for their men. Do not omit the social, but stress these religious activities for men.

In the following we are offering you a program for religious activities on the part of your men. All these objectives are carried by some of our Brotherhoods somewhere. Your men should also be enlisted in this kind of work. If you have no Brotherhood organize one. Also have your men's Bible class engage in these activities besides merely studying the Bible on Sundays.

I. The Purpose

The Purpose of this religious work is to (1) awaken, (2) deepen, and (3) develop the religious or spiritual life of our men, and through them the spiritual life of church and community.

In some cases it must first be *awakened.* This may be the greatest need of your members, church and community. In all cases, *deepening* and *development* are ever needed. None of our men are as spiritual, Christ-like as they should be. There is much room for growth into the likeness of Christ, into a full grown child of God. This should be our honest desire and highest aim.

Not only *deepening* the spiritual life, but also *developing,* broadening it as well. To deepen it may only affect the emotions. The intellect must also be spiritualized. Not only the heart, but also the head captured for God. This calls for Religious Education.

We would have our men, church and community, not only feel, but likewise *know.* Not only simply have faith, but be intelligent in their belief. With Paul being able to say: "For I know whom I have believed."

Therefore a development as well as deepening of the spiritual life is desirable. Education, as well as inspiration.

Thus this religious work is to *awaken, deepen* and *develop* the religious or spiritual life of our men.

II. The Program

The means to accomplish this purpose, outlined above are two fold; (1) Private, and (2) Public.

Private—The Private Means would include: (a) Personal and Family Devotions, (b) Prayer, (c) Bible reading and study, (d) Reading of Religious papers and literature.

Public—The Public Means include: (a) Church services, (b) Sunday School, (c) Bible Classes, (d) Prayer meetings, (e) Christian Fellowship, (f) Soul Winning, Personal Evangelism, (g) Men's Retreats, (h) Holy Communion, (Brotherhood Corporate Communion).

Such a religious life program should be included in the activities of every organization of Evangelical men and receive much thought and attention on the part of the pastor.

The pastor should seek earnestly to interest the men in all these means of *awakening, deepening and developing their spiritual life:*

Here is the real test of every men's organization: To what extent are these spiritual means being helpfully used by the men of the church? This spells success or failure.

III. The Plans

Here now comes the big problem. *How to get above Program across,* to get people to use these God-given means outlined above, for *awakening, deepening* and *developing* the *religious or spiritual life.* Here's the rub.

The first essential is *a Religious Work Committee,* someone responsible for the promotion of these religious activities. If all did all of these things, a committee would not be needed. If all people were real Christians, there would be little use for pastors and churches. If all were well, we wouldn't need doctors and hospitals. But that's the *if.*

Just because the program above is not fully appreciated and appropriated, because these outlined means are not used as they should be, there is need for the best effort of a Religious Work Committee in your men's organization. It is to assist the church in this, its primary and paramount mission.

Now as to Methods. What *Plans* can be proposed?

The Plans or Methods suggested to the Religious Work Committee are:

1. *The Practice of Prayer,* privately and publicly. Make teaching and training in praying, a part of your program. Give lessons on prayer and let the men lead in prayer at meetings and elsewhere.

2. *The Training in Devotions.* Public devotions often lead to private devotions. And private devotions make participation in public devotions and worship desirable and profitable. Allow the men to have a part or lead in public devotions and they will plan and practice private devotions. But do not fail to teach and train them in private and family devotions. Some men's societies have *no* devotions when the pastor is absent. What a disgrace for a Christian organization. Train them to do it themselves. They will then also be capable of conducting such with sick, shut-ins, and their own families.

3. *The Establishment of the Family Altar, Family Devotions.* What a need for the welfare of our homes, churches and country! The most powerful influences on the whole life of our children is the home.

Have the Family Altar spoken on often, the Why and How emphasized. Perhaps the latter even the more. Many would have a Family Altar, if they were shown how to do it. Distribute literature on the subject. Very helpful Family Altar Literature, folders, pamphlets, etc., may be secured from our Headquarters and the Family Altar League, 826 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. Recommend and display good, simple Prayer and Devotional books.

Introduce our "Daily Talks with God," and "Christian Family Altar." Early in the year and the Lenten season are good times for emphasizing and establishing Family Altars. But the Religious Work Committee, in cooperation with the pastor, should work at this problem all the year around. How many Family Altars in your church?

Work until all families have daily devotions.

Write our Headquarters for free literature on "The Family Altar."

4. *The Church Attendance.* This means "Everybody at church every Sunday." No excuses accepted, only reasons that can face God. Many men rarely miss a meeting of their society or class, but are rarely seen in church. All wrong. The church services should hold first place. The very least a member can and should do, *is to attend church*—regularly.

Here is work for our Religious Work Committee. Have church attendance campaigns.

And not only to get members to go, but to get non-members to go too. Tell and train your men to invite and bring their non-churchly and un-churchly neighbors and friends to the church services. Be sure to go after the newcomers that move to your town or your vicinity or street. "Go along the highways and hedges and compel them to come in."

5. *Personal and Visitation Evangelism.* Winning men to Christ and the church. This is a type of religious work men should be engaged in. Other denominations have their men do evangelistic work. It is encouraging to see Evangelicals also doing this kind of work. We could cite a number of successful campaigns in Evangelical churches within the last few years.

Not only have your men ask folks to buy tickets for minstrels and other church socials, attend a smoker, etc., but have them also invite folks to church and Sunday school. They can do the former, why not the latter.

Make a list of non-church members and have committees of men visit and invite them systematically. When one falls let another try. Do not give up. The Lenten season is a good time for Evangelism.

Since the Synod now has a Committee on Evangelism, we no doubt will have definite and helpful literature on this phase of church work.

6. Sunday School Attendance

The school is not only for children and women, but also for men. Men belong there. Ask your men not to send, but to bring their children. Urge them to go themselves. "Where men go, boys

follow." Classes of boys 12 years and up should have men teachers. Evangelical men should have a place and part in the Sunday school. Urge your men to attend, and get others to attend.

7. Men's Bible Class

Many churches successfully help the spiritual life of their men by organizing special classes for men. These meet Sundays in connection with the Church School. Men need Bible knowledge.

Every men's society should aim and help to have such a Bible Class for the men of the church and community.

The Religious Work Committee should cooperate with the Sunday school forces in establishing and maintaining such a class.

8. Reading of Devotional Literature

Reading of Devotional Literature which includes our church papers, "Evangelical Herald" and "Friedensbote."

From time to time the Religious Work Committee should recommend and display helpful Christian books for reading either individually or collectively. A "Book Table" in the vestibule is found in many progressive churches, either all the year or at certain seasons. The pastor should name suitable books and literature. The Advent and Lenten seasons are especially appropriate for such displays and readings. There is great need for such books in view of the mass of mushy, sentimental, shallow books and magazines found in so many homes, even of church members.

To create an interest in such books and papers, someone should briefly give the contents and point out their value for our Christian life. Here is work for men.

9. Special Men's Services

for and by men of the church and community. Some churches have conducted such services for years with great blessings to all concerned.

All these are among the many plans which may be followed by your men under the supervision and direction of a Religious Work Committee in utilizing the *various Means to accomplish the Purpose* of awakening, deepening and developing the spiritual life of our men.

You will find the following books helpful in this kind of religious work for men:

"The Ministry of Laymen," by Palmer.

"The Way to Win," by Fischer.

"Visitation Evangelism," by Kernehan.

"The Adult Program of the Church School," by Brewbaker.

THE PASTOR'S STUDY HOUR*

C. Norman Bartlett, B.D.

The pastor's study hour is the garden in which spiritual food is raised for the congregation. If the people of the church ruthlessly trample upon this garden, they have no right to complain about the food served from the pulpit. For his people's sake, then, as well as for his own, let the minister build a fence around this garden, put up a "No Trespass" sign, and get busy producing the very best kind of sermonic fruit he can raise. To drop the metaphor, what his study hour means to the preacher will largely determine what his pulpit means to the people.

There are three things a growing preacher must do: he must *faithfully prepare* his sermons and perform his *other pastoral* duties from week to week; he must keep abreast of the times; and he must build for the future by using every means at his command to improve himself in the ability to know more thoroughly, to think more creatively and to preach more eloquently. How may the pastor so utilize the hours reserved for study as most effectively to further these several vitally important ends? That is the question before us. And it is a question which, in the last analysis, every man must answer for himself. A minister ought first of all to make a study of the workings of his own mind to find out just what particular program of thought and study will yield for him the richest returns. Carelessness in such preliminary self-analysis may doom him to long years of comparative failure. It will not do for a preacher brazenly to defy his mental idiosyncrasies.

Selecting Reading Matter

As to current literature, it is my firm conviction that many ministers devote all too large a proportion of their study hours to reading the books of the day. Do not misunderstand me. I am not a reactionary. I am fully aware that a preacher simply must keep abreast of the times if he would speak convincingly to his own generation. But there is such a thing as a preacher being so up to date that he is of very little use in the Kingdom of God. He may spend so much time keeping up with the current events of the world that he makes little or no progress in his grasp of the eternal verities of the Lord. Some pulpits pitch and rock so wildly on all the waves of popular isms and vagaries that the people in the congregation become spiritually seasick. Preachers must not suffer themselves to be so molded by the spirit of their age that they forget how to mold their age with the Spirit of Christ.

A young bride made her first coffee. It was so weak that only

*Reprinted by special permission of "The Expositor," Cleveland, O.

love enabled her husband to drink it. What was the trouble? She had used only a teaspoonful of coffee to a cup of water, whereas she should have used a large tablespoonful. That crudely symbolizes what is the matter with a good deal of the preaching of today. Unless the minister lets his abundant acquaintance with current events and modern thought percolate through a sufficiently generous measure of *Biblical knowledge* and *spiritual insight,* his sermons are likely to be as week as that young brides' coffee. Let us all beware of using too much water for the amount of coffee in the percolator!

Creative Thinking

A preacher would do well to devote the same number of hours to creative thinking that he gives to systematic study of books. He cannot expect to grow in the ministry unless he tries to make his ability to think creatively keep pace with whatever harvests of scholarship he may be able to reap through the passing years. A minister may be a middleman or a producer. If he is a middleman instead of a producer, he spends nearly all his study hours ransacking books of one kind and another for ideas to be used in his next Sunday's sermon. And then perhaps on Saturday morning he arranges these posies picked in the gardens of other men's minds in lovely little logical bouquets. What a way to prepare a sermon! The man who pursues such a method is destined to grow neither in scholarship nor in thinking ability. The preacher who is a producer and not a middleman devotes part of his study hours to *thinking out his own sermons* and the rest of the time to the reading of books that will increase his wealth of knowledge and strengthen his power of thought. The world needs far more producers in the ministry today.

Building the Sermon

Let me try to describe the processes by which a sermon shapes itself in my mind. I do not consider my way of preparing a sermon to be ideal by any means. Only too well do I realize that my particular methods are more or less tangled up with my personal limitations. Some people have the ability to map out their main and even their subdivisions before putting pen to paper, and then all they have to do is to furnish the rooms of the house, as it were. They possess what I may venture to call the gift of sermonic prevision. I lack this gift, most unfortunately. I do not build my sermons with my mind; they grow up in my mind like vines and trees. There are four distinct and successive thought processes in my preparation of a sermon—germinal brooding, amplifying meditation, logical arrangement and rhetorical expression. Taking

a text, I brood over it until, like a star evolving from nebulous fire mist, there emerges before my mind some one outstanding thought that appears sufficiently promising and suggestive to be amplified to sermon length. With this central thought firmly grasped, I then proceed, with no other books than the Bible before me, to write down all the thoughts bearing upon the theme that I can possibly think of. I literally think my mind dry on the subject, for unless I think out a good many more thoughts in a sermon, I am very likely to discover that none of them are worth using. For me the process of logical arrangement that follows is the hardest part of sermon preparation. It is like getting order out of chaos. I have so many more ideas than I can make use of that I have to dig my way out of a sort of mental cave-in before I begin to see daylight. Such shovelling is backbreaking work. Finally, having put together some sort of an apology for a sermonic frame-work or abstract, I sit down Saturday morning to write out my morning sermon in full. For an hour on Saturday evening and another hour Sunday morning I read my sermon over a number of times, not memorizing it, but letting it soak in like a heavy rain that it may burst forth like a fountain in the pulpit. Sometimes, alas, the fountain proves to be but a series of fitful spurts! My evening sermon is more flexible in structure than my morning sermon and is preached extempore. On rare occasions I have a sudden inspiration. Perhaps only a few moments before it is time to preach, a thought will so powerfully grip my mind that I cannot resist the temptation to follow it out into its potential ramifications, instead of using the sermon I have prepared. This is a sort of adventure that may prove richly rewarding or grimly disappointing. But nothing venture, nothing gain. I ought to say, however, that I do not neglect to prepare a sermon, in the hope that I may get an inspiration after I go into the pulpit. That would be foolhardiness and a sinful tempting of the Lord.

Organizing the Study Period

I devote three hours a morning to creative work of my sermons. During the other three hours of my study period I carry on three distinctly different lines of reading and study. My first hour I devote to exhaustive research work in some part of the Bible, to increase my scholarly knowledge of the Scriptures; my second hour I devote to Philosophy, to strengthen my power for abstract thought; my third hour I devote to reading literary classics, to quicken my imagination and facility in expression. I figure that if I should give the whole three hours to scholarly research, I would be in danger of becoming a pedant; if I should devote the three hours to Philosophy, I would be in peril of becoming a dreamer;

if I should give them all to literature, I would be very likely to degenerate into a mere rhetorician. And so, to preserve a proper intellectual balance, I follow out these three separate and distinctly different courses of study.

First, a word as to my study of Philosophy. Its chief value lies in the mental discipline that comes through trying to master it—for it is not by any means an easy subject. It might be well for every preacher regularly to read books that will tax his brain power to the limit. We must build up mental muscles of steel if we expect victoriously to battle against the world, the flesh and the devil. How can we hope to do this if we read only light and ephemeral present-day books that are easy to master? A preacher spending all his time in easy reading is like a prize-fighter—pardon the comparison—choosing his sparring partners from among the patients in a tuberculosis hospital. We all need to battle with books beyond our powers that we may be delivered from an exaggerated estimate of our intellectual ability.

The Study of Sermons

Along with my other inspirational reading in the various fields of literature past and present, I like to read sermons. It is a splendid thing for a preacher to be a constant student—not thief or despoiler—of other men's sermons. He ought not to use their ideas, but rather study their methods and analyze their sermons homiletically. Let him use Beecher, Brooks, Robertson, Bushnell, MacLaren as instruments of comparison by which to correct the weaknesses in his own preaching. Looking through such powerful glasses, we shall all find a good many paste diamonds among our collection of homiletic gems. We need to read the work of real preachers as a sort of serum to make us immune against poisonous germs of flattery from members of our congregations. Unless a preacher keeps steadily before him a higher homiletic standard than his hearers have, he will steadily lose in power to lift his hearers to loftier heights of thought and life by the magnetism of eloquence. It is of the utmost importance that after leaving the seminary we ministers preserve and improve our ability intelligently to tear our own work to pieces. If we are satisfied with our sermons, that does not necessarily indicate they are beyond criticism; it may only go to show that our critical knives are becoming woefully dull and need to be resharpened by another course in homiletics. We must learn how to train critical guns upon those sermonic masterpieces of ours that seem to rise to the dizzy heights of perfection.

And now as to Bible study. Every preacher ought to give the Bible first place in all his study. He should make it his chosen field

for intensive research. His love for it should grow with the years. The study of the New Testament in the original will prove richly rewarding. It is like looking through a microscope and finding ever new beauties in objects of the natural world.

Expository Preaching

No preacher should be ashamed to set out with the avowed purpose of mastering the art of expository preaching. This type of preaching, far from shutting the preacher's mind up within narrow walls, demolishes those walls and discloses a veritable maze of alluring trails into unexplored country. Expository preaching is in ill odor in many quarters because the preacher has piled so much fuel of technical scholarship into his mind that he has allowed the flames of spiritual and imaginative insight to be well-nigh extinguished. With every fresh supply of scholarly fuel, the preacher ought to open the draft of prayerful meditation. Might it not be an excellent idea for him to write out an original devotional exposition of the parts of the Bible he may happen to be studying exegetically? He would thus be building at one and the same time a store of scholarly knowledge and a reservoir of his own spiritual meditations from which to draw when sorely beset by the pressing demands of later and busier years. *The ideal expository preacher knows his Bible scientifically, loves it poetically and preaches it artistically.*

O preachers, study your Bibles with all the aids of scholarship, let it thrill your souls and set your imagination on fire as the poet is inspired by the glories of Nature; in your preaching seek to paint upon the minds and hearts of your hearers the beauties of the Bible that the Spirit of God has first painted upon your own soul. We preachers can make the Bible mean no more to our hearers than we let it mean to ourselves. Let all other studies be subordinate to and contributory toward our study of God's Holy Word. Let us study everything that will make our minds more brilliant and our hearts more sensitive instruments for unveiling ever new splendors in the heavens of divine grace that gleam like millions of twinkling stars in the skies of Scriptural truth.

Zum Jubiläum der Augsburger Konfession 25. Juni 1530

Von Dr. C. Schieler.

I.

Die Augsburger Konfesssion war von solcher Bedeutung für den Fortgang und die Entwicklung der Reformation, des ganzen Protestantismus, daß man die vierhundertste Wiederkehr des Tages, an welchem die Konfession auf dem Reichstag zu Augsburg überreicht wurde, nicht stillschweigend übergehen darf. Zudem gehört die Augsburger Konfession zu den Bekenntnisschriften unsrer Evangelischen Synode.

Zunächst sei die Aufmerksamkeit der Leser auf die

Vorgeschichte der Konfession

gelenkt, oder wie es dazu kam, daß die Reformatoren diese Bekenntnisschrift verfaßten und dem Kaiser Karl V. und den versammelten Reichsfürsten überreichten.

Die deutschen Fürsten und Stände evangelischen Glaubens hatten gegen die Beschlüsse des Reichstags zu Speier am 20. April 1529 einen energischen Protest und am 25. April eine Appellation eingereicht. Ihre Lage gestaltete sich aber bald darauf so, daß ihnen nur noch ein doppelter Ausweg übrig blieb: entweder mußten sie sich mit den Reformierten in der Schweiz vereinigen, um eine stark konsolidierte Gegenmacht dem Kaiser und den römisch-katholischen Fürsten und Prälaten entgegenzustellen, oder auf die Bildung einer allgemeinen deutschen Nationalkirche im Bund mit der katholischen Reformpartei Deutschlands hinarbeiten, die Berufung auf eine nationale Kirchenversammlung fortwährend zu erneuern und in dieser „den Sinn und Inhalt des evangelischen Glaubens in einem möglichst vollständigen Bekenntnis als feststehende Grundlage zur Unterhandlung und zur Vereinigung mit allen, die sich mehr oder weniger dem Glaubensprinzip Luthers näherten, öffentlich darstellen." Ersteres, das Schutzbündnis zwischen den deutschen und schweizerischen Reformatoren, erwies sich infolge des Scheiterns der Vereinigungsversuche in Marburg und Schwabach im Oktober 1529 als hoffnungslos. Und auch das Zweite stieß auf so große Schwierigkeiten, daß es ebenfalls aufgegeben werden mußte. Die Ereignisse vernichteten diese Hoffnung. Der Kaiser Karl V. hatte nämlich mit Frankreich Frieden geschlossen und mit dem Papst Clemens VII. ein Bündnis zur Unterdrückung der reformatorischen Bestrebungen in Deutschland geschlossen. Die Abgesandten, welche dem Kaiser die Protestation und Appellation gegen den Reichstagsabschied von Speier überbringen sollten, wurden darum sehr ungnädig auf-

genommen. Dies wurde bald in Deutschland bekannt und erregte Unruhe in den protestantischen Kreisen; dazu kamen Gerüchte über des Kaisers Pläne in Deutschland, der recht langsam aus Italien nach Deutschland zog und zumal die Tatsache, daß er jetzt dem Papst ergeben war und sich von ihm beeinflussen ließ. All dieses nötigte die evangelischen Fürsten, an eine ernstliche Gegenwehr zu denken Zu einem förmlichen Schutzbündnis kam es jedoch noch nicht. Jedoch hatte Luther zu Marburg (3. Oktober 1529) im Verein mit andern Theologen fünfzehn Artikel entworfen, und diesen waren die siebzehn Artikel für den Konvent zu Schwabach vorangegangen. Zu dieser Grundlage der Uebereinstimmung im Glauben aber verweigerten bereits die Abgeordneten von Ulm und Straßburg ihre Zustimmung, da im zehnten Artikel das lutherische Dogma vom Abendmahl nach seiner ganzen Strenge ausgesprochen war, während in Marburg der Vergleich hierüber verschoben worden war. Das waren keine günstigen Aussichten für die nächste Zukunft, wenn es auch den protestantischen Ständen an Glaubensmut und Zuversicht für den endgiltigen Sieg ihrer Sache nicht fehlte. Und Luther war es in erster Linie, der hierin allen voranleuchtete.

Da erschien, im Januar 1530, das Ausschreiben des Kaisers, mit dem er von Bologna aus, wo er an seinem Geburtstag vom Papst zum Kaiser und König der Lombardei gekrönt wurde und zum Zeichen ihrer engen Verbindung mit dem Papst in demselben Palast wohnte, **einen neuen Reichstag nach Augsburg auf den 8. April zusammenberief.** Das Schreiben lautete über Erwarten friedlich. Hinsichtlich der Religion ermahnte und verhieß der Kaiser, „die Zwietracht beizulegen, Widerwillen zu lassen, vergangnen Irrsal unserm Seligmacher zu ergeben und Fleiß anzukehren, alle eins jeglichen Gutbedünken, Opinion und Meinung in Liebe und Gütigkeit zu verstehen und zu erwegen, alles so zu beiden Teilen nicht recht ist ausgelegt oder gehandelt, abzutun, durch uns alle eine einige und wahre Religion anzunehmen und zu halten und wie wir alle unter Einem Christo sind und streiten, also alle in Einer Gemeinschaft, Kirche und Einigkeit zu leben.“ Weder das Wormser Edikt noch die Zerwürfnis in Speier waren in dem Schreiben erwähnt, wohl aber Hilfe gegen die Türken gefordert, die im Jahre 1529 sogar Wien belagert hatten. Am 11. März war dieses Ausschreiben in den Händen des Kurfürsten von Sachsen in Torgau. Seine Räte empfahlen ihm sofort, den Reichstag in Person zu besuchen, und sein Kanzler, Dr. Gregorius Brück, erklärte es für gut, weil dem kaiserlichen Ausschreiben zufolge „eines jeglichen Opinion und Meinung“ gehört werden solle, „daß solche Meinung, darauf unser teil bis anher gestanden und verharret, ordentlich in Schrif-

ten zusammengezogen werde mit gründlicher Bewährung derselben aus der Schrift, damit man solches vorzutragen habe, wo man den Ständen auch die Prediger in den Verhandlungen die Sachen vorzutragen lassen ja nit gestatten würde." (Siehe Förstemann, Urkundenbuch usw.) Daraufhin beauftragte ein kurfürstliches Schreiben vom 14. März Luther, Justus Jonas, Melanchthon und Bugenhagen, sich über die zwiespältigen Artikel, „beide im Glauben und auch in andern äußerlichen Ceremonien," zu beraten und schon am 20. März persönlich in Torgau darüber Bericht zu erstatten. Aber obwohl der auf Visitation abwesende Jonas noch in der Nacht des 14. von Luther brieflich herbeigerufen wurde, und man sich alsbald an die Arbeit machte, war es doch nicht möglich, den Wunsch des Kurfürsten in so kurzer Zeit zu erfüllen.

Am 21. folgte eine zweite Aufforderung, aber wahrscheinlich erst am 27. wurde dem Kurfürsten das Resultat der Beratung in Torgau überreicht. Dies sind die sogenannten Torgauer Artikel. Und es ist nicht ganz klargestellt, wie sich diese zu den siebzehn Schwabacher Artikel verhalten. Man hielt früher die Torgauer und Schwabacher Artikel für dieselben; jetzt ist die Meinung allgemeiner, daß die ersteren eine Erweiterung der letzteren seien, oder man findet die Schwabacher Artikel im ersten, die Torgauer in dem zweiten Teil der Augsburger Konfession. **Jedenfalls bilden die Schwabacher und Torgauer Artikel die Grundlage der Augsburger Konfession.**

Was das dem Kurfürsten in Torgau überreichte Schriftstück betrifft, ist noch eine Bemerkung zur Klarstellung notwendig. Der kurfürstliche Auftrag ging nämlich dahin, **„vom Glauben und Ceremonien"** zu berichten. Aber das Schriftstück, welches wir mit völliger Sicherheit als das in Torgau übergebene „Gutachten" bezeichnen können (und das wir nicht mehr besitzen) ist wohl sicher mit einem uns erhaltenen Gutachten identisch, welches von dem Kurfürsten als wichtiges Aktenstück nach Augsburg mitgenommen wurde, und dies handelt nur von den Ceremonien. Die Verfasser erklären darüber: weil nach den Zugeständnissen der Widersacher selbst die in den kurfürstlichen Landen gepredigte Lehre „christlich und tröstlich sei und an ihr selbs recht und der Zwietracht sich vornämlich erhoben habe wegen etlicher Mißbräuche," die durch Menschenlehre und Satzungen eingeführt seien, hätten sie sich auf die Ceremonien beschränkt. Und die Reformatoren hielten das um so mehr für das Richtige, weil sie nicht zugeben konnten, daß ihre Lehre eine neue, von der echten, echten evangelischen Kirchenlehre abweichende sei. Uebrigens war der Aufsatz, wie der Kurfürst es gewünscht hatte, zunächst nur ein wenig ausgefeiltes Gutachten zu seiner eignen Information; er nahm jedoch eine weitere Bearbeitung zu offi-

zieller Vorlage auf dem Reichstag schon in Aussicht und empfahl auch für den Fall, daß man zu wissen wünsche, was sonst im Kurfürstentum gepredigt werde, **„Artikel zu überantworten, darin die ganze Lehre ordentlich gefaßt wäre."** Dies geschah dann auch und Melanchthon ward der Verfasser.

Auf dem Reichstag von Augsburg.

Am 3. April verließ Luther mit Melanchthon und Jonas Wittenberg, um den Kurfürsten, wenn nicht nach Augsburg, so doch wenigstens bis nach Coburg zu begleiten. Unterwegs schlossen sich noch Georg Spalatin aus Altenburg, Johann Agricola aus Eisleben und Kaspar Aquila aus Saalfeld an. Man reiste über Altenburg zunächst nach Weimar, wo der Kurfürst mit seinem Gefolge am Palmsonntag das Abendmahl feierte und einige Tage rastete. Am 15. April, am Karfreitag, traf man an der Grenze des kurfürstlichen Gebietes, in Coburg ein. Hier wollte der Kurfürst weitere Nachricht über den Termin für die wirkliche Eröffnung des Reichstages abwarten. Luther predigte hier am Osterfest und dem darauffolgenden Montag und Donnerstag über die österlichen Texte und diese großen Heilstatsachen.

Am Freitag, dem 22., lief bei dem Kurfürsten eine Weisung vonseiten des Kaisers ein, zu Ende des Monats in Augsburg zu erscheinen. Gleich am folgenden Morgen brach er mit seinen Begleitern auf. Luther war nicht unter denselben. Gern hätte der Kurfürst ihn als treuen Berater mit sich nach Augsburg genommen, und das kaiserliche Ausschreiben, nach welchem alles Frühere vergessen sein sollte, ließ einen Augenblick den Gedanken aufkommen, daß der Kaiser auch Luthers Anwesenheit daselbst gestatten würde. Auf Luther lag aber noch die Reichsacht und der kirchliche Bann. Deshalb konnte er nicht so vor dem Kaiser, den Reichsständen und Vertretern des Papstes und der Kirche erscheinen, auch wenn der Kaiser noch so günstig gestimmt gewesen wäre, und es hätte auch kein freies Geleite für ihn gelten können. Er selber, scheint so unbefangen gewesen sein, sein Mitgehen dennoch für möglich zu halten, wie er an Freunde berichtete. Ruhige Ueberlegung entschied anders und es war besser so. Der Kurfürst wünschte indessen, Luther wenigstens so nahe als möglich zu haben. Der Rat von Nürnberg wurde darum angegangen, ihn während des Reichstags aufzunehmen. Aber während die kleine Reichsstadt Weißenburg dem Gefolge des Kurfürsten freies Geleit gewährte, „Niemand ausgeschlossen," waren die Nürnberger schwachmütig genug, aus Furcht vor dem Kaiser nicht nur seine Aufnahme abzulehnen, sondern auch ihm sogar das freie Geleit zu versagen. Damit war die Frage entschieden. Luther erfuhr wahrscheinlich nur, daß seine Weiterreise wegen der auf ihm lastenden Reichsacht untunlich sei.

Am 23. April in der Nacht wurde er auf die Feste Coburg gebracht, während der Kurfürst weiterreiste und am 2. Mai in Augsburg anlangte. So war der Reformator wenigstens in der Nähe; es war nicht schwer, mit ihm in stetem Verkehr zu bleiben. Eine Botschaft von einem zum andern Ort brauchte damals in der Regel vier Tage.

Auf der Reise nach Augsburg, schon in Coburg, und dann in Augsburg hatte Melanchthon an der dem Kaiser nach dem Ausschreiben zu übergebenden „Apologie" weiter gearbeitet. Der Kaiser sollte durch sie gründlich über die Religionsstreitigkeiten unterrichtet und der evangelische Glaube verteidigt werden. Daher der anfängliche Name für diese Arbeit „Apologie." In Augsburg angekommen, sah er sich veranlaßt, dem Schriftstück eine ganz andre Gestalt zu geben. Dort erfuhr er nämlich, daß Johann Eck von Ingolstadt auf Veranlassung der bayerischen Herzöge eine dem Kaiser gewidmete Schrift hatte ausgehen lassen, worin er 404 Artikel aus den Schriften derer zusammengestellt hatte, „die den Frieden der Kirche stören." Professor Eck hatte dies getan, beauftragt von der theologischen Fakultät in Ingolstadt, welche von den bayerischen Herzögen auf Veranlassung des Kardinal Erzbischof Albrecht von Mainz aufgefordert worden war, „alle Artikel, welche von Luther seit zwölf Jahren vorgebracht worden wären, in einem Auszug zusammenzustellen und ihren Mißklang mit dem wahren christlichen Glauben zu zeigen, samt der Art, wie sie am zweckmäßigsten widerlegt werden könnten, damit die Herzöge diese Schrift im Fall Bedürfens gleich bei der Hand hätten." In dieser Schrift hatte Eck außer den in der päpstlichen Bannbulle gegen Luther verurteilten Sätzen, andre aus den Schriften von Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Karlstadt usw. aus dem Zusammenhang gerissene Stellen unter bestimmte Rubriken gebracht und auf eine Linie gestellt mit Auslassungen von Wiedertäufer, wobei er sich zugleich erbot, die Unchristlichkeit der angeführten Sätze in einer öffentlichen Disputation vor Kaiser und Reich darzutun. Daraufhin entschloß sich Melanchthon, auch die wichtigsten **Glaubensartikel** in die „Apologie" aufzunehmen; auch wollte er dem Ganzen mehr die Form eines **Bekenntnisses** geben, da der Kaiser keine Zeit haben würde, lange Ausführungen anzuhören. Am 11. Mai meldete er Luther diesen Plan: **„Ich habe fast alle Artikel des Glaubens zusammengestellt, weil Eck die teuflichsten Teufeleien gegen uns verfaßt hat.** Gegen diese habe ich ein Heilmittel entgegenstellen wollen." (Vgl. Corp. Ref. II. 45.)

Auch in andern evangelischen Gebieten hatte man sich gerüstet, der kaiserlichen Aufforderung zu begegnen. Die Nürnberger hatten von ihren Predigern einen „Ratschlag" herstellen lassen, und der

Markgraf Georg von Brandenburg hatte schon früher seine vornehmsten Pfarrer aufgefordert, jeder für sich Rechenschaft von ihrem Glauben zu geben. Aber man fand es ratsamer, sich dem von Melanchthon verfaßten Bekenntnis anzuschließen. Und Melanchthon war damit bereits am 11. Mai schon so weit fertig, daß der Kurfürst die „Apologie" an Luther schicken konnte „mit dem gnädigen Begehren," falls ihm etwas mißfiele, es am Rand zu bemerken und dann das Exemplar „wohl verwahrt und verpetschaft" unverzüglich zurückzuschicken.

Melanchthons Hauptbestreben bei der Abfassung der Schrift war gemäß der ihm eignen Neigung und Art hierbei überall daraufhin gerichtet, die evangelische Lehre als übereinstimmend mit der allgemein christlichen und überlieferten Kirchenlehre und die bei den Protestanten durchgeführte Reformation nur als Abschaffung gewisser praktischer Mißbräuche darzustellen. Man darf als gewiß annehmen, daß Luther es nicht über sich vermocht hätte, vor dem Reichstag und den auf ihm anwesenden Papisten und Feinden des Evangeliums seinerseits ein Bekenntnis vorzutragen, das die Schärfe und Tiefe des Gegensatzes so wenig hervorkehrte. Aber er opferte persönliches Empfinden den Verhältnissen und billigte freudig die Schrift seines zu diesem Werk des Friedens berufenen Freundes, der wie kaum ein andrer dazu befähigt war. Er schrieb bei der Rücksendung: „Die (Schrift) gefället mir fast wohl und weiß nichts daran zu bessern noch ändern, würde sich auch nicht schicken, **denn ich so sanft und leise nicht treten kann**; Christus, unser Herr, helfe, daß sie viel und große Frucht schaffe, wie wir hoffen und bitten." Den Kurfürsten ermunterte er in einem Brief voll zarter Trostesworte, daß sein Herz fest und geduldig bleiben möge; . . . wies ihn hin auf das große Zeichen der Liebe Gottes gegen ihn, daß dieser ihm und seinem Land das Wort der Gnade so reichlich gönne und namentlich die zarte Jugend darin heranwachsen lasse als ein lustig Paradies Gottes.

Unterdessen arbeitete Melanchthon noch weiter an seiner Bekenntnisschrift, um hie und da zu bessern, Fehlendes zu ergänzen, hatte häufig Unterredungen mit Justus Jonas, dem sächsischen Kanzler Gregor Brück und andern, stand auch in schriftlichem und mündlichem Verkehr mit dem nachgiebigen Bischof von Augsburg Christoph Stadion und dem vermittelnden kaiserlichen Sekretär Alphons Valdes. Besondre Schwierigkeit erwuchs ihm, als Landgraf Philipp von Hessen eine Verwerfung der Zwinglischen Lehre in dem Bekenntnis nicht zugeben wollte. Melanchthon legte aber darauf Gewicht nicht nur wegen ihrer Verwerflichkeit an sich, sondern hauptsächlich im Interesse einer Versöhnung mit den Katholiken. Er rief die Vermittlung Luthers an; dieser aber zögerte lange

und schrieb endlich — am 13. Juni — an Melanchthon, bat ihn warm, übrigens in aller Ruhe, daß er sich des Glaubens der Widersacher in der Abendmahlslehre nicht annehmen und durch ihre „süßen guten" Worte nicht bewegen lassen möge. Es war eine harte Zeit für den Autor der Bekenntnisschrift: die schwierige Lage der Dinge in Augsburg, Drohungen erbitterter katholischer Gegner, die Sorgen um das dem Kaiser vorzulegende Bekenntnis und die Folgen, die es haben werde, all das setzte ihm hart zu; dazu kamen Nachtwachen und Schlaflosigkeit, die ihn in steigende Unruhe versetzten, ja in Angst und Schwermut trieben. Und da war es sein väterlicher Freund Luther, der ihm immer neue Worte der Ermunterung, des Trostes und des Rates nach Augsburg sandte, und ein Lutherbiograph (Köstlin, S. 442) bemerkt, diese Worte Luthers gehörten zu mächtigsten Zeugnissen seines Geistes und Charakters überhaupt. Eine Stelle aus Luthers Briefen dieser kritischen Periode an Philipp lautet: „Laß die Sache noch so groß sein, groß ist auch, der sie handelt und angefangen hat; denn nicht unsre Sache ist sie . . . Er spricht: Wirf deine Sorge auf den Herrn, der Herr ist nahe allen, die ihn anrufen. Spricht er das in den Wind, oder wirft er sein Wort Tieren vor? . . . . Dich quält deine Weltweisheit und nicht die Theologie. Als ob ihr mit euren unnützen Sorgen etwas ausrichten könntet!" usw.

Die Ankunft des Kaisers zog sich sehr lange hin. Längere Zeit hielt er sich in Innsbruck auf, umgeben von päpstlichen Nuntien, welche seine Schritte überwachten und seine Gesinnung gegen die Protestanten durch immer neue Anklagen feindseliger aufregten. Ihrem Haß leisteten den eifrigsten Beistand die drei heftigsten Gegner der Reformation, der Kurfürst Joachim von Brandenburg, der Herzog Georg von Sachsen und der Herzog Wilhelm von Bayern. Wie der Kaiser jetzt gesinnt war, erhellt aus einem Schreiben an den Kurfürsten von Sachsen, in welchem er demselben die heftigsten Vorwürfe über sein Verhalten gegen Kaiser und Reich machte und mit Bestimmtheit die Abstellung der evangelischen Predigt in Augsburg forderte. Der Kurfürst und der Landgraf Philipp hatten nämlich nach ihrer Ankunft in Augsburg die Geistlichen ihres Gefolges aufgefordert, in den Kirchen der Stadt zu predigen. Offensichtlich war ein Umschwung in der Gesinnung des Kaisers eingetreten. Von der Milde des Ausschreibens war in den jetzigen kaiserlichen Auslassungen nichts mehr zu merken. Der Tod des Großkanzlers des Kaisers, Gattinara (in Innsbruck 4. Juni), wurde von allen evangelisch Gesinnten als schwerer Schlag empfunden, und die nächsten Ereignisse schienen den gehegten Befürchtungen recht zu geben.

Endlich, am 15. Juni, hielt der Kaiser seinen Einzug in Augs-

burg. Es war der Tag vor dem Frohnleichnamsfest und nicht ohne Vorbedacht hatte man diesen Tag gewählt. Denn alsbald forderte der Kaiser von den Fürsten die Teilnahme an der Prozession am folgenden Tag und von neuem die Abstellung der evangelischen Predigt. Das erstere Ansinnen verweigerten die evangelischen Fürsten, wobei sich besonders der Markgraf Georg von Brandenburg durch sein mannhaftes Bekenntnis zum evangelischen Glauben auszeichnete und der Kurfürst Johann seinen Beinamen des Standhaften bewährte. In der Predigtfrage bequemten sie sich zu einem Kompromiß, wonach auch den Katholischen das Predigen untersagt wurde. Dies alles und was man sonst noch von der Stimmung in der kaiserlichen Umgebung hörte, war nicht ohne Einfluß auf Ton und Haltung des Bekenntnisses, woran Melanchthon immer noch arbeitete. Es war ja sein Bestreben, wie er selber bekennt, sich im Ausdruck möglichst der hergebrachten Lehrweise anzuschließen, suchte angesichts der drohenden Haltung der Gegner alle Schärfen zu vermeiden, den Gegensatz auch hier und da zu verhüllen und dachte sogar daran, im Interesse der dadurch zu erzielenden Eintracht nicht unerhebliche Konzessionen zu machen. Alsbald nach der Ankunft des Kaisers suchte er Fühlung mit den kaiserlichen Sekretären, von welchen der eine, Cornelius Schepper, seine Befürchtungen bestätigte, daß der Kaiser entschlossen sei, gegen die Lutheraner vorzugehen, während der andre, ein Spanier, sich von Melanchthon überzeugen ließ, daß der Handel nicht so schwierig sei, als man am Hof des Kaisers annehme. Im wesentlichen handle es sich um beiderlei Gestalt des Sakraments, die Priesterehe und die Abschafffung der Einzelmesse vonseiten der Lutherischen. Der Kaiser, der jetzt gern ohne weitläufiges öffentliches Verhör und Disputation eine Einigung erzielt hätte, teilte die Auslassungen Melanchthons, die ihm mitgeteilt worden waren, dem Kardinal Campeggi mit. Dieser wollte zwar von der Abstellung der Einzelmesse (auch Privatmesse genannt) nichts wissen, sprach sich aber im übrigen nicht ungünstig darüber aus. So wurde Melanchthon am 18. Juni durch den Sekretär Valdes vom Kaiser beauftragt, aufs kürzeste ein Verzeichnis der Streitpunkte vorzulegen. Deshalb zögerte Melanchthon, das Bekenntnis fertig zu stellen, gab sich sogar der Hoffnung hin, man könnte von der Uebergabe desselben absehen. Aber in einer Beratung mit Brück und andern Gelehrten wurden seine geheimen Abmachungen nicht gutgeheißen, weil man dadurch den Rechtsboden des kaiserlichen Ausschreibens zu verlieren in Gefahr käme. Namentlich erklärte der Rat von Nürnberg, der wie Reutlingen sich an der gemeinsamen Kundgebung zu beteiligen beschlossen hatte, auf der Uebergabe eines Bekenntnisses in deutscher und lateinischer Sprache bestehen zu müssen.

Donnerstag, 23. Juni, wurde eine letzte Lesung und die endgültige Festsetzung des Textes, wohl namentlich hinsichtlich des Schlusses (Epilogus) und der von Kanzler Brück herrührenden Vorrede, vorgenommen. Daran beteiligten sich der Kurfürst von Sachsen, der Landgraf von Hessen, der Markgraf von Brandenburg, die Herzöge von Lüneburg, die Gesandten von Nürnberg und Reutlingen, sowie die verschiedenen Räte und nicht weniger als zwölf Theologen. Melanchthon hatte dem kaiserlichen Sekretär Einsicht von dem Entwurf nehmen lassen, war aber sehr erstaunt und erschrocken, daß dieser ihn trotz seiner maßvollen Haltung noch zu scharf fand. Deshalb änderte er und feilte an Ausdrücken bis zum letzten Augenblick. Daß er noch entgegenkommender würde, gestattete man ihm nicht. Er wollte den Bischöfen Jurisdiktion zuerkennen, drang aber nicht durch. Der Landgraf Philipp beanstandete die Fassung des Artikels vom Abendmahl, konnte aber nichts erreichen und fügte sich. Daß von einer Verwerfung des Papsttums nichts darin stund, wurde beanstandet, aber mit Rücksicht auf den Kaiser ließ man es dabei bewenden. Da die Oberländer nur mit Ausschluß des Artikels X beitreten wollten, wurden sie zurückgewiesen. (Artikel X, vom Abendmahl.) Dagegen unterschrieben: der Kurfürst Johann von Sachsen, Markgraf Georg von Brandenburg, Herzog Ernst von Braunschweig-Lüneburg, Landgraf Philipp von Hessen, Fürst Wolfgang von Anhalt und die Vertreter der Städte Nürnberg und Reutlingen; wenigstens die lateinischen Exemplare sind auch noch von Kurprinz Johann Friedrich und Herzog Franz von Lüneburg unterschrieben. Und noch während des Reichstags erklärten auch die Städte Weißenburg (im Nordgau), Heilbronn, Kempten und Windsheim ihren Beitritt.

Am nächsten Tag, Freitag, 24. Juni, sollte die Uebergabe stattfinden, in der zweiten Sitzung des Reichstages im Rathaus. Der päpstliche Gesandte, Kardinal Campeggi hielt zuerst eine Rede, die ganz im Sinn des Papstes die Religionsstreitigkeiten behandelte. Darauf wollten die protestantischen Fürsten dem erhaltenen Befehl gemäß ihr Glaubensbekenntnis vortragen, erhielten aber vom Kaiser durch den Markgrafen Georg von Brandenburg den abfälligen Bescheid, zuerst müßten die Gesandten von Oesterreich, Kärnten und Krain wegen des Türkenkriegs gehört werden. Nun stellten sich die anwesenden protestantischen Fürsten dem kaiserlichen Thron gegenüber und ließen durch den Kanzler Brück nochmals den Antrag stellen, ihre Konfession vorlesen zu dürfen. Allein auch diese Bitte war vergeblich, vielmehr suchte man, um ein **öffentliches** Vorlesen des evangelischen Bekenntnisses zu verhindern, die Zeit bis zum Abend mit der Anhörung der österreichischen Gesandten hinzu bringen. Darauf erneuerten nochmals, obwohl wiederum vergebens,

der sächsische Kurfürst und seine Glaubensgenossen das Ansuchen um die Vorlesung. Die Katholischen suchten nun das Bekenntnis schriftlich zu erhalten, aber nicht mündlich zu vernehmen; die Evangelischen indessen wollten die aufgesetzte Schrift so lange in den Händen behalten, bis ihre Vorlesung gestattet sei. Deshalb verschob der Kaiser die Vorlesung auf den folgenden Tag.

Die Ueberreichung der Augsburger Konfession.

Endlich, am 25. Juni, es war ein Samstag, nachmittags 3 Uhr, konnten die Evangelischen Fürsten und Vertreter einiger Städte ihr Glaubensbekenntnis vor Kaiser und Reich öffentlich vorlesen. Auf Befehl des Kaisers sollte der lang ersehnte Akt in der Kapelle des bischöflichen Palastes stattfinden, nicht im Rathaus, weil da der Zudrang der Menschenmenge allzu stark werde. Die Kapelle faßte nur zweihundert Personen, weshalb auf kaiserliche Anordnung bloß die Fürsten und Räte (katholische wie protestantische) eintreten durften; alle andern sollten sich im Bischofshof versammeln. Das war wiederum recht kleinlich, eine Schikane gegen die Protestanten, was kein günstiges Licht auf des Kaisers Charakter wirft, aber auch zeigt, wie ängstlich die katholischen Würdenträger vermeiden wollten, daß das evangelische Bekenntnis in weite Kreise dringe. Die Toren!

Es traten nun in die Mitte der Versammlung der Kanzler Dr. Brück von Kursachsen und Dr. Christian Bayer, von welchen der erstere die lateinische, der andre die deutsche Konfession in Händen hatte. Da erhoben sich sogleich die protestantischen Fürsten von ihren Stühlen, allein der Kaiser befahl ihnen, sitzen zu bleiben. Karl V. wollte zuerst die Konfession in lateinischer Sprache hören, aber der Kurfürst von Sachsen entgegnete, man befinde sich auf deutschem Grund und Boden, worauf der Kaiser die Vorlesung in deutscher Sprache gestattete. Sie geschah durch den Dr. Bayer und es dauerte von 4 bis 6 Uhr und er tat es in so lautem und vernehmlichem Ton, daß es nicht nur in der Kapelle, sondern auch im Bischofshof verstanden wurde. Dann wurden die beiden Exemplare dem Kaiser überreicht. Das lateinische behielt der Kaiser, das deutsche übergab er dem Reichserzkanzler, Kurfürst Albrecht von Mainz. (Vergleiche Ranke, Deutsche Geschichte.) Der Eindruck, welche die Vorlesung der Konfession hervorrief, war „wider alle Erwartung bedeutungsvoll großartig.“ Sie atmete eine aufrichtige Liebe zum Frieden, den man fern von aller ränkevollen Streitsucht unter der Obhut und Mitwirkung des Kaisers zu erlangen hoffte; sie ward im Namen der evangelischen Fürsten und Stände, nicht der Theologen und Geistlichen allein, in feierlicher Weise übergeben,

bestärke die Glaubensverwandten in ihrer Treue und Standhaftigkeit, und nicht wenige von den Gegnern wurden zu einer würdigeren Ansicht und gerechteren Beurteilung der Streitfrage und des Reformationswerkes überhaupt hingeleitet.

Die beiden dem Kaiser übergebenen Exemplare sind bis jetzt nicht wieder aufgefunden worden. Der Kaiser ließ noch durch den Pfalzgrafen Friedrich antworten, er wolle diese hochwichtige Angelegenheit in Erwägung ziehen und darauf seinen Bescheid erteilen; übrigens sollte die übergebene Konfession nicht ohne kaiserliche Erlaubnis gedruckt werden. Dies versprachen auch die protestantischen Fürsten. Aber bald nach der Vorlesung erschien ein fehlerhafter Abdruck. Deswegen sahen sie sich genötigt, durch Melanchthon noch während des Reichstags einen richtigen Abdruck in beiden Sprachen zu Wittenberg besorgen zu lassen. **Dies ist die erste Ausgabe der Augsburger Konfession.** Am 27. Juni wurde die Konfession römisch-katholischer Theologen vor der ganzen Reichsversammlung zur Widerlegung übergeben. Dieselbe war aber weitschweifig in so gehässigen, heftigen Ausdrücken gehalten, daß der Kaiser sie „dergestalt zerraufet und gerollet, daß von 280 Blättern nur 12 ganz geblieben sind." Auf kaiserlichen Befehl mußte eine neue Konfutation angefertigt werden. Melanchthon erfaßte dann eine Verteidigung des Glaubensbekenntnisses, „**Apologie** der Augsburger Konfession."

Gleich nach der Uebergabe der Konfession wurde eine vollständige Abschrift an Luther gesandt mit dem Ersuchen, er möge sich äußern, ob noch Konzessionen an die römischen Gegner möglich sein würden. Hierüber schrieb er: „Tag und Nacht beschäftige ich mich damit, bewege es in mir hin und her, denke nach, disputiere bei mir, durchforsche dafür die Schrift, und immer stärker wird in mir die volle Gewißheit von unsrer Lehre und immer fester werde ich, daß ich mir, ob Gott will, nun nichts mehr werde nehmen lassen, es gehe drüber, wie es wolle." Er hätte sicherlich manches anders, namentlich schärfer ausgedrückt und gelegentlich darin Auslassungen über das Fegfeuer, den Heiligenkult und besonders über den „Papst, den Antichrist" zu sehen gewünscht. Aber doch spendete er der ganzen Arbeit wie früher dem Bruchstück den gleichen Beifall. Er war hoch erfreut, daß dort in Augsburg der evangelische Glaube zum Wort gekommen, dessen einfacher Widerruf neun Jahre vorher in Worms von Luther gefordert worden war. Er sah das Psalmwort erfüllt: **„Ich redete von deinen Zeugnissen vor Königen,"** und war gewiß, daß auch das Weitere sich erfüllen müsse: **„und ich wurde nicht zu Schanden."** (Psalm 119, 46.)

Soviel genüge über die Genesis der Augsburger Konfession. Inhalt und Bedeutung derselben in einem zweiten Artikel!

Theologischer „Aktivismus"

Von Professor Werner Petersmann, Th. D.

Im leichtfertigen Schlagwörterkampf der Gegenwart, die als Zeitalter von Großstadt und Maschine, Auto und Kino, Radio und Flugzeug in besondrer Weise mit hastigen, ratternden Parolen, mit der Lichtreklame von in die Augen fallenden Stichworten zu arbeiten scheint, ist, seit Stockholm zumal, das treffliche Wörtlein „**Aktivismus**" mehr oder weniger für das angloamerikanische Christentum in Beschlag genommen. Das amerikanische Christentum, angelsächsisch bestimmt in seinem kirchenpolitischen Pragmatismus, reformiert in seinem heiligenden Weltgestaltungsdrang, jung, optimistisch, selbstbewußt in seiner kolonialen Geschichtslosigkeit und Traditionsabsage, auf Grund deren es aktuelle Aufgaben unternehmungslustig in experimenteller Tatkraft anfaßt — dieses Christentum ist „aktivistisch." Und ihm gegenüber ist gerade das deutsche Christentum („deutsch" im weitesten kulturellen Sinn genommen) mit seiner germanischen „Gemüt"haftigkeit, Innerlichkeit und Mystik, seiner lutherischen Konzentration auf Seele und Gewissen und seiner Bestimmtheit durch Lehre, Geschichte, Tradition und Theologie darum der exemplarische Antipode. Es scheint das genaue Gegenteil. Es ist, wie wiederum die Parole ausgegeben wird — und das nicht ohne Werturteil — „quietistisch." Und diese Eigenschaft erscheint als etwas, das überwunden werden muß in der Zeit unsrer brennenden Weltnöte, die die Christenheit auf den Kampfplatz ruft. Die Zeit metaphysischen Spekulierens und dogmatischen Haderns, der Lehrstreitigkeiten und Haarspaltereien ist vorüber. Die Uhr steht auf Tat, auf Handeln, auf „Aktivismus" im heraufgebrochenen sozialen Zeitalter.

An solchem Urteil ist manches richtig und manches falsch. Wir wollen hier zum Zweck des besseren gegenseitigen Verstehens lediglich die Sache in ein westlicheres Licht stellen. Der amerikanische Aktivismus nämlich, schlechthin „Aktivismus" genannt, ist eine bestimmte Art des Aktivismus: er ist **ethisch-praktischer Aktivismus.** Er ist Aktivismus der tathaften Weltgestaltung, des christlich-moralischen Kulturaufbaus. Und ihm gegenüber der deutsche „Quietismus"? Ist er ein „die Hände in den Schoß legen," ist er „Quies," „Ruhe" und „Ausruhen"? In außerordentlich glücklicher Weise führt eine Lesefrucht aus Martin Rades Glaubenslehre (Leopold Klotz Verlag, 1927, Bd. 2, p. 212 f.) in eine Aussichtsrichtung, die gerade dem aktivistischen Gemüt des Amerikaners den verständlichsten Anblick der Sache gewährt. Und das mag nicht ganz von ungefähr so kommen, daß eben der Mann zu diesem Anblick führt, der mit seiner Zeitschrift „Christliche Welt" (L. Klotz Verlag) in Deutschland seit langem führend für ein ethisch-praktisch „aktivi-

stisches" Christentum eingetreten ist. Im Zusammenhang seiner Dogmatik an jener erwähnten Stelle beschreibt er zuerst in einem warmen Paragraphen den jedem Christen, gerade dem aktivistischesten, so nötigen **Christlichen „Quietismus"** im Sinn jenes Wortes aus Matthäus 11, das man übertragen mag:

„Ich will euch ausruhen lassen . . .
Und ihr werdet ein Ausruhen finden für eure Seelen."

Eine solche „quies," diese Ruhe ist der Ruhepunkt, Rückhalt und Kraftquell für alle echte Aktivität, und die Stille von Sonntag und Feierfag liegt als dynamische Sammlung vor dem Aktivismus der Woche. Und dann folgt der Paragraph über den **Christlichen „Aktivismus."** Hier nun kommt Rade neben dem ethischen Aktivismus auch auf die Theologen und den Streit der Theologen zu reden und auf ihre kritische (vielen zu kritische) Forschungs- und Denkarbeit: „Der Streit der Theologen . . . hat die Aktivität der evangelischen Christenheit viel gelähmt. Aber man soll nicht darüber trauern und schelten. Es steckt auch in diesen Kämpfen ein Aktivismus, der, wo nur rechter Gewissensernst dahinter steht, des Segens nicht entbehren kann. Wer die ganze theologische Arbeit der vier Jahrhunderte, insbesondre aber der letzten anderthalb, nur als Ausgeburt gelehrter Rechthaberei ansehen wollte, würde Unrecht tun . . . So steckt ein Stück von heiligem Aktivismus gerade auch in der vielgeschmähten modernen Theologie . . . wenn ihre Arbeit wahrhaft kritisch ist, im Geist der Wahrhaftigkeit rücksichtslos wägend und urteilend, so ist die darauf verwendete Kraft auch auf ein gutes Werk verwandt . . . Aber wieder ist der Christ auch hier nicht allein. Und aus dem Fehlen und Gelingen der Genossen, die miteinander forschen, erwachsen Erkenntnis und Verständnis immer neu . . . Der Kampf um die Wahrheit ist das tägliche Stahlbad evangelischer Theologie. Diese Art Aktivismus . . . usw. . . ." Da überträgt Rade mit glücklichen Griffen das treffliche Stichwort des „Aktivismus" auch auf die Theologie und ihre Arbeit. Sie ist ihrem Wesen nach nicht quietistische Besinnlichkeit und scholastischer Luxus, „luxus sacer," Haarspalterei samt Streitsucht aus der Studierstuben-Sicherheit der „beati possidentes" in Staatskirchen und Pfründen, sondern wahrlich auch „Aktivismus," innerer Aktivismus, **Aktivismus des Geistes und Denkens, Aktivismus des christlichen Geistesringens um Wahrheit und Klarheit, um Erkenntnis und Verständnis des Evangeliums zu seiner rechten wahrheits- und wirklichkeitsgetreuen Auslegung, Darlegung und Anwendung auf unsre Nöte und Fragen.** Auch das ist aktuelles Handeln, Schaffen und Gestalten, fundamentales aktuelles Handeln zu Weltanschauung und Weltaufbau christlicher Kultur. Solange wir als „verbi divini ministri" die frohe Botschaft vom Heil

zu bringen haben, steht Wahrheit und Klarheit, Verstehen und Deuten, Anbringen und Applizieren dieses Evangeliums in der rechten und echten evangelischen und keiner andern Weise wahrlich da als Arbeitsziel eines ganz gewaltigen und notwendigen Aktivismus, welcher der ethisch-praktischen Aktivität notwendig vorangehen muß. Denn freilich, Glaube ohne Werke ist tot. Aber Werke ohne Glauben, Werke die nicht aus dem Glauben kommen, Werke, die nicht schlechthin unter der klaren Direktion des Glaubens stehen? Theologische Glaubensklarheit allein ist freilich leer. Aber Wirken allein wiederum ohne jene fundamentale Klarheit ist blind, willkürlich, gefährlichen Abwegen nahe. So ist auch der geistige Aktivismus positiv schaffend und nötige Arbeit, mag es auch bisweilen vorkommen, daß er, entsagungsvoll und mühselig genug, Kärrnertagewerk tut in Grenzgebieten. Und vielmehr ist es genau so „Quietismus" schlechter und gefährlicher Sorte, wenn der ethisch-praktische Aktivismus die fundamentale theologische Aktivität beiseite läßt, wie wenn der theologische Aktivismus die Tat versäumt. Denk-„Quietismus" wie Tat-„Quietismus" sind beide Skylla und Charybdis jenes goldenen christlichen Weges, der immer wieder, spiralenhaft, vom echten christlichen „Quietismus" des Erfassens und von ihm zum Tat-Aktivismus praktischer Umsetzung in evangelisches Handeln verläuft. Immer durch jene drei Stadien (um sie ins Schema zu bringen):

1. Christlicher „Quietismus" (Erbauung).
2. Theologischer Denk-„Aktivismus" (Erkenntnis).
3. Ethisch-praktischer Tat-„Aktivismus" (Handeln).

Uebrigens erhält man einen lebendigen Einblick in diesen aktuellen theologischen Aktivismus, wenn man die Berichte über die **deutschen Theologentage** durchgeht. Diese Theologentage, aus den Fakultätentagen unter Anregung H. Greßmanns (starb vor einigen Jahren auf einer Vortragsreise in Chicago) erwachsen, sind neuerdings eingerichtete Aussprachveranstaltungen der deutschen theologischen Fakultäten mit Vorträgen und Diskussionen über akute wissenschaftliche Probleme, und sie geben mit der Demonstration des theologischen Denk- und Diskussionsaktivismus zugleich auch eine Orientierung über den aktuellen Stand der Gottesgelehrsamkeit von so unmittelbarer Art, wie sie auf anderm Weg kaum erreichbar sein dürfte. In den beiden bisher vorliegenden Berichten über die beiden stattgefundenen Konferenzen wird nun durch die Folge von Verträgen und anschließenden Aussprachen der leitenden deutschen Theologen deren heutiger Aktivismus gewissermaßen im Druckfilm vorgeführt.

Der erste Theologentag fand Herbst 1927 in der Lutherstadt Eisenach statt, unter dem Vorsitz des Dekans der Berliner Fakultät

D. A. Titius. (Der sehr ausführliche Bericht von Titius offiziell herausgegeben unter dem Titel „Deutsche Theologie." Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht 1928. Preis 6 RM.) Noch sammelt sich die Aktivität nicht um ein besonders Generalthema. In diesem Mangel äußert sich das erste Experimentieren. Doch treten bestimmte leitende Fragekomplexe heraus, die im übrigen zeigen, wie sehr die modernste Forschung aus den Vorhöfen „circa sacra" energisch hineinstrebt „in sacra": das Kirchenproblem, Luther, die Christusfrage der Gegenwart, die Bedeutung der dialektischen Theologie für das Alte und Neue Testament, ferner Mission und Religionsgeschichte in ihrer neuerkannten Wichtigkeit für die gesamte Theologie und ihre einzelnen Fächer. Ueber fünfundsiebzig bekannte Theologen weist die Rednerliste auf aus dem deutschen Sprachgebiet. Neuartig und für einen bei aller notwendigen Schärfe der Auseinandersetzung **cooperativen** Geist zeugend ist das früher ungewohnte Zusammentreffen und Zusammendenken der Konservativen mit den Liberalen. Und dazu brachte die Konferenz eine erste ausführliche Diskussion zwischen den Vertretern der historisch-kritischen Theologie und denen der „theologia moderna" der Krisis, der Neuest-Positiven. „Vor dreißig Jahren hätte niemand eine **gemeinsame** wissenschaftliche Tagung **aller Richtungen** der deutschen Theologie für ersprießlich oder auch nur für möglich gehalten." (Titius.) Ferner ist es doch auch sehr bemerkenswert als Zeichen der Zeit, wenn Titius repräsentativ sagen kann: „Wir alle . . . sind in unserm Denken **kirchlicher** geworden als früher, die unersetzliche Bedeutung der kirchlichen Gemeinschaft für den Fortbestand des geschichtlichen Christentums und unsre Mitverantwortung dafür ist uns zu vollem Bewußtsein gekommen." Allerdings das alles nicht in bequemen quietistischen Kurzschlüssen billiger Ironik: „Das aber darf und wird uns nicht hindern, in heiligem Wahrheitsernst und mit unbedingter Offenheit über die wichtigsten und schweren Lebensfragen zu sprechen, die auf unsrer Tagesordnung stehen." Nicht nur die straffe gedankliche Linienführung der General- und Spezialvorträge durch jeweilige Fachmänner, sondern vor allem die nachfolgenden Diskussionen und Schlußworte zeigen jenen besagten Aktivismus kritisch erfassenden und gestaltenden Geistes im Ringen um die Wahrheit und das Verständnis des Wortes Gottes für unser Heute in lebendigster Aktualität. Mir selbst ist dieser kritische Aktivismus am eindrücklichsten und respekterheischend stets besonders an Auseinandersetzungen aufgegangen, in der mündlichen Dialogik der Diskussion oder der schriftlichen der Buchbesprechung. Hier nun reiht sich in der Aussprache eine gewichtige Vortragsbesprechung an die andre, bis eine Synthese mit dem Vortrag durch das Schlußwort des Referenten hergestellt ist. So zum Beispiel nach K. L.

Schmidts Vortrag über das Kirchenproblem im Urchristentum, über den Feine-Halle, Wendt-Jena, Windisch-Leiden, Schmitz-Münster, Fezer-Tübingen, Schütz-Kiel, Procksch-Erlangen, v. Dobschütz-Halle, Hoffmann-Wien kritisch-aktivistisch diskutieren. Oder die problematische Aussprache nach Bultmanns Referat über „Die dialektische Theologie und das neue Testament" seitens Lietzmann, Feine, Wobbermin, Hirsch, Windisch, Schmitz, Hempel, Eißfeldt, Koepp, Müller, Paulus, Heinzelmann, Hoffmann, Schmidt.

Der zweite Theologentag, vorbereitet von der Bonner Fakultät und deren Dekan D. E. Pfennigsdorf und abgehalten in Frankfurt a. M. 1928 („Deutsche Theologie," 2. Band. „Der Erlösungsgedanke." Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht 1929. 6 RM.) stand unter einem Generalthema: Der Erlösungsgedanke. Und zwar bei Luther (Hermelink, im Urchristentum (Lohmeyer), in der gegenwärtigen Glaubenslehre (Lütgert), im Religionsunterricht (Niebergall), im Spätjudentum (Jeremias), im Urchristentum und Hellenismus (Deißner), im Alten Testament (Procksch), und in der Religionsgeschichte (Clemen). Ueber fünfzig Redner stehen diesmal auf der Rednerliste. Besonders lebendig und illustrativ sind nach Hermelinks durch Rudolf Ottos Ideen des Numinosen bestimmten Luthervortrag wie nach Lohmeyers modern-eschatologisch gedeuteten urchristlichem Erlösungsbegriff die Aussprache seitens Ritschl, Meyer, Bornkamm, Weinel, Dibelius, Titius, Windisch, Büchsel, Althaus und andrer mehr. Schärfer als auf dem ersten Tag scheint hier alles konzentriert. In Stil und Problematik, gehaltlicher wie formaler Durchführung ist hier jener theologische Aktivismus in lebendiger Aktualität zu sehen, den wir, unter Hinweis auf dies konkrete Anschauungsmaterial, andeuten wollten.

Kurzum: keiner der beiden Aktivismen ist also überflüssig, beide sind zur Gesundheit auf dem gemeinsamen „quietistischen" Grund notwendig. Und jeder braucht den andern. Der ethisch-praktische Aktivismus braucht den theologischen, um nicht blind, nebelhaft, schwärmerisch zu werden; und wiederum, der theologische den ethisch-praktischen, damit er nicht leer, abstrakt, unfruchtbar bleibt. Der „Quietismus" des Denkversäumnisses ist ebenso gefährlich wie der des Tatversäumnisses. Und jene beiden „Aktivismen" zur Zeit fälschlich genug wenn auch auf Grund empirischer Beobachtungen als feindliche Brüder betrachtet und behandelt, sollten sich finden zu **„Cooperation."** Ist nun der praktische Aktivismus angelsächsisches Charisma, so der theologische deutsches. Und zur kontributiven **Vermittlung** hätten da in diesen wie in andern Dingen die Kirchen deutscher Abstammung eine schicksalsmäßig gottgegebene historische „Sendung." Ob sie diese freilich erkennen und erfüllen?

Wesen, Wert und Wahrheit der Religion

Von Prof. R. H. Grützmacher.

III.

Die Wahrheit der Religion.

In manchen Kreisen, wie in dem anglo-amerikanischen Pragmatismus, wie in der deutschen Philosophie von Vaihinger, glaubt man schon eine genügend positive Einschätzung der Religion vollzogen zu haben, wenn man ihren praktischen Wert anerkennt. Die Religion ist nützlich für die Kultur, hilft dem einzelnen Menschen über Not und Schuld hinweg, befriedigt und beruhigt ihn. Ob das aber alles Einbildung, Fremd- und Selbstsuggestion sind, erscheint völlig gleichgültig. Wenn Gott auch gar nicht existierte, so soll doch die Vorstellung, „als ob" er existierte dieselben Dienste leisten. Allein das ist schon ein psychologischer Irrtum. In demselben Augenblick, wo ein Mensch weiß, daß er nur Wasser aber keinen Wein getrunken hat, verspürt er nichts mehr von den kräftigen Wirkungen des Weines. Sobald Gott eine Illusion für mich wird, werden es auch die angeblich von ihm ausgehenden Wirkungen und sie verlieren allen Wert für mich. Gerade zur Erhaltung des Wertes der Religion, muß darum auch ihre Wahrheit behauptet werden. Unter Wahrheit der Religion ist zu verstehen, daß der Annahme der Religion von der Existenz einer Gottheit und ihres Verkehres mit der Welt durch Offenbarung eine überweltlich-innerweltliche Realität entspricht. **Die Religion ist wahr, bedeutet: Gott und seine Offenbarung existieren objektiv und sind nicht etwa nur Einbildungen und Gespinste des Menschen.** Für diese Behauptung hat die christliche Apologetik einzutreten und zwar auf zweierlei Weise, 1. daß sie die mannigfachen Versuche einer innerweltlichen Erklärung der Religion als unzureichend, 2. daß sie die Selbstaussagen der Religion über ihre Wahrheit als vorstellbar und begründet erweist.

1.

Eine weitverbreitete Theorie sieht in der Religion nichts anders als eine menschliche Erfindung, deren Motive sie klar zu machen sucht. Schon die alten griechischen Skeptiker meinten, daß die Religion nicht aus der Natur und Wirklichkeit erwachsen sei, sondern vielmehr eine Erfindung menschlicher Berechnung und zwar wesentlich aus egoistischen Motiven. Diese Meinung hat im 19. Jahrhundert in höchster Vollendung und schärfster Zuspitzung Ludwig **Feuerbach** in seinen Schriften über das Wesen des Christentums und der Religion vertreten. Er ist der eigentliche Verfechter einer **illusionistischen Erklärung der Religion aus egoistischen Motiven.** Nach Feuerbach sind die Götter nichts anders als die als

verwirklicht gedachten, in persönliche überweltliche Wesen verwandelten Wünsche des Menschen. Gott ist die Summe aller menschlichen Wünsche, deren Erfüllung in ein Jenseits verlegt wurde, weil sie im Diesseits nicht erreichbar erschien. Der in der Religion behauptete Verkehr des Menschen mit einem überweltlichen Gott ist in Wirklichkeit nichts anders als der Verkehr des Menschen mit seinem eigenen Wunschwesen. Der in dieser Welt nicht befriedigte Egoismus schafft sich eine andre Wirklichkeit als Paradies, in dem alle Träume Wahrheit werden. Das Geheimnis der Theologie ist die Anthropologie, Gott nichts anders als der von Schwachheit und Endlichkeit befreite und in seinen Wünschen befriedigte Mensch. Hat man aber diesen Tatbestand durchschaut, und die Religion als Illusion erkannt, so wird man auf sie verzichten und statt von ihren phantastischen Gebilden Hilfe zu erwarten, selbst Hand anlegen, um die menschliche Lage in der Welt tatkräftig zu verbessern. Feuerbach bezeichnet es als sein letztes Ziel, die Menschen aus Kandidaten des Jenseits zu Studenten des Diesseits zu machen.

Prüft man diese Theorie nach, so liegt ihr bescheidener Wahrheitskern, der sie für viele verführerisch gemacht hat, darin, daß im Menschen allerdings Anknüpfungspunkte für die Erkenntnis und Bestimmung des Jenseits vorhanden sind. Wir könnten Göttliches nicht schauen, wenn nicht selbst Göttliches in uns vorhanden wäre, entsprechend dem Goethewort: „Wär nicht das Auge sonnenhaft, wie könnte es die Sonne schauen?“ Insofern erwächst allerdings aus der Anthropologie die Theologie, aber doch nur deshalb, weil tatsächlich zuvor die Gottheit im Menschen ein Stück ihres Ebenbildes verwirklicht hat. Wäre das nicht der Fall, so wäre nicht der geringste Anlaß, ja nicht einmal eine Möglichkeit, wie der Mensch ein Jenseits erfinden konnte, auch nicht, wenn man seine unbefriedigten Wünsche in Rechnung zieht. Für diese würde der Mensch — wie es tatsächlich auch alle irreligiösen Menschen tun — auf eine bessere Zukunft im Diesseits hoffen und hier allerlei Mittel in Bewegung setzen zur Erfüllung seiner Bedürfnisse. Erst wenn der Mensch aus anderweitigen Gründen an eine Gottheit glaubt, dann kann er auch sie in den Dienst des Egoismus stellen und hat das leider auch reichlich getan. **Nicht der Egoismus schafft Gott, sondern erst der geglaubte Gott wird egoistisch ausgenützt.**

Zudem aber ist es durchaus unzutreffend, daß der Gottesgedanke im innersten Wesen der Befriedigung des menschlichen Egoismus dient und die Religion nichts anders will als Erfüllung menschlicher Wünsche. Gott ist vielmehr sehr oft der Gegner unsrer natürlichen Triebe und ihrer innerweltlichen Ziele, er ist durchaus

nicht der Diener, sondern der oft sehr unbequeme Herr des Menschen. Nietzsche hat Gott deshalb abgelehnt, weil er in ihm die Grenze für die Erfüllung seines Verlangens nach einem Uebermenschen fand. Gerade von stark religiösen Menschen wird Gott als Druck empfunden, bekennt doch der russische Dichter Dostojewski: Gott hat mich immer nur gequält. Einen solchen Gott erfindet aber menschlicher Egoismus nicht, er ist das Gegenteil menschlicher Wunschträume. **Abschließend ist gegen Feuerbachs Theorie zu sagen, daß sich eine göttliche Ueberwelt ohne reale Unterlagen weder erfinden läßt, noch daß das egoistische Motiv den Kern der Religion trifft.**

Eine zweite Theorie will die Entstehung der Religion aus **theoretischen Bedürfnissen des menschlichen Verstandes ableiten.** Der Mensch fragt bei jedem Ding nach seiner Ursache und so geht er weiter und weiter zurück, zuletzt aber möchte er doch zu einem Abschluß kommen und den findet er nur in einem Absoluten, das „causa sui" ist, das heißt bei den Göttlichem. Ebenso sollten sinnliche Wahrnehmung den Menschen über das unmittelbar Geschaute hinwegführen zum Unendlichen, das hinter allem Endlichen steht. Der Trieb zum Absoluten und Unendlichen wäre danach eine Ursache für die Entstehung des Glaubens an eine absolute und unendliche Gotteswelt. So hat der berühmte englische Religionsgeschichtlicher Max Müller die Religion verstanden und zwar nicht, um sie als Illusion zu entwerten. **Denn dieser Trieb zum Absoluten und Unendlichen läßt sich nur verstehen, wenn hinter ihm eine absolute und unendliche Wirklichkeit steht, welche den Menschen zu ihrer Anerkennung treibt.** Denn sonst liegt gar kein Grund vor, warum die Menschen sich nicht mit einem sichtbaren Himmel begnügt hätten, oder warum sie mit ihrem kausalem Denken nicht von einer endlichen Ursache zur andern fortgeschritten wären.

Von religionsfeindlicher Seite ist diese Theorie von Männern wie dem Positivisten Comte, den Religionsforschern Taylor und Lippert, wie dem Monisten Häckel abgewandelt. Sie sehen in der Religion **eine falsche und irrtümliche Auslegung der Erscheinungen der Wirklichkeit.** Der primitive Mensch erlebte das Gewitter, aber er konnte es sich noch nicht wissenschaftlich als elektrische Entladung erklären, darum nahm er an, daß in ihm feindliche Götter miteinander kämpfen. Oder er sah plötzlich einen Menschen im Starrkrampf dahinsinken und da er diese Erscheinung nicht medizinisch erklären konnte, sah er in ihr den Angriff eines bösen Gottes. Bemerkte der Urmensch in der Nähe eines Grabes einen Schmetterling oder einen Wurm, so verführte ihn das zu der Meinung, daß sich in ihm die Seele des Toten verwandelt habe. Religion

soll nichts anders sein als primitive Wissenschaft, die aber sterben muß, sobald die wirkliche Wissenschaft einsetzt. So hat der Positivismus in der Geschichte der Menschheit auf das religiöse das wissenschaftliche Zeitalter folgen lassen. Aber gerade diese Konstruktion ist offenkundig falsch. Denn die Religion besteht noch immer und es ist ihr gar nicht eingefallen, zu Gunsten der Wissenschaft abzudanken. Es gibt nicht nur zu gleicher Zeit religiöse und wissenschaftliche Menschen nebeneinander, sondern es gab und es gibt auch religiöse Persönlichkeiten, die zugleich große Gelehrte sind, wie umgekehrt Natur- und Geschichtswissenschaftler mit tiefer Religiosität. Mögen auch in allen Zeiten religiöse und wissenschaftliche Welterklärungen enger miteinander verbunden gewesen sein und man damals Geister und Götter an die Stelle innerweltlicher Kausalitäten gesetzt haben — identisch sind sie nie gewesen. Denn wieder müssen wir behaupten, wenn es nicht irgendwie tatsächlich eine Gotteswelt gäbe, und diese sich den Menschen bezeugt hätte, so würden die primitiven Menschen am wenigsten darauf gekommen sein, sie zur Erklärung innerweltlicher Erscheinungen heranzuziehen. Sie hätten statt dessen einfach falsche innerweltliche Ursachen angenommen, den Starrkrampf eines Menschen aus verborgenem Gift, den Tod aus innerer Zersetzung erklärt. **Auch der Versuch die Religion aus falscher Befriedigung seines theoretisch-wissenschaftlichen Triebes zu erklären, erweist sich als völlig mißlungen.**

Eine dritte Theorie greift zur Klärung der Religion auf **Gemütsbewegungen der menschlichen Seele zurück und zwar bestimmter auf die Furcht.** So hat es in früheren Jahrhunderten schon Hume getan. In neuerer Zeit D. V. Strauß. Der Urmensch erlebt die Schrecken der Natur, den Wettersturm, das Dunkel der Nacht, den unheimlichen Tod. Diese Erscheinungen führt der Mensch auf Götter zurück. Die Beziehung dieser Götterwelt zur Furcht des Menschen kann doppelt gedacht werden. Entweder kann die Götterwelt dazu dienen, den Menschen von seiner Furcht zu befreien, oder sie kann seine Angst verstärken. Bei der ersten Auffassung handelt es sich nur um eine Spezialisierung der früher besprochenen Feuerbachschen Wunschtheorie, gegen die die dort geltend gemachten Argumente in gleicher Weise sprechen. Im andern Fall ist es unbegreiflich, wie und warum der Mensch zur Verstärkung seiner Furcht sich Götter erfinden sollte. Die Vertreter dieser Meinung setzen doch immer voraus, daß es keine Götter gibt und darum auch nicht die geringsten Spuren des Göttlichen in der Welt. Dann aber bleibt es unbegreiflich, wie die Menschen aus blauem Dunst feste Burgen für die Zwingherrschaft von Göttern bauen konnten. Der Mensch hatte eigentlich genug an innerweltlichen, schreckenerregenden Objekten und keinen Anlaß sich noch fürch-

terlichere Gestalten in den Göttern zu erfinden. Sodann aber ist es unwahr, daß die Religion niemals andre Gefühle in Anspruch genommen hat, wie die Angst. Der primitive Mensch ist garnicht solch ein Angstwesen, wie der moderne, nervöse Gelehrte. Er hat sich gegenüber dem Wetter, dem Kampf, selbst dem Tod gegenüber viel mutiger verhalten. Außerdem hat auch schon die einfache Religion neben den Gefühlen der Angst und des Schauders auch solche der Ehrfurcht und Beruhigung in sich getragen. Ein katholischer Apologet, Seitz, bemerkt treffend über diesen ganzen Gedankenkreis: „Daß statt kindlicher Gottesfurcht kindische Gespensterfurcht der Menschheit in die Wiege gelegt sei, ist ebenso widersinnig wie die Annahme, einer von vornherein erkrankten statt einer urwüchsig kraftvollen Natur und paßt am allerwenigsten zur Hypothese von uranfänglich hartem Kampf ums Dasein, welchen nur die stärksten Naturen zu überdauern vermochten." **Auch die mit dem Gefühl der Furcht arbeitende illusionistische Erklärung der Religion hält einer genaueren Prüfung nicht stand.**

Reichen die normalen geistigen Funktionen der menschlichen Seele nicht aus, um die Religion ihres Wahrheitsgehaltes zu entkleiden, so hat man versucht, sie aus **besondern eigenartigen oder gar anormalen Erscheinungen abzuleiten.** Die populäre Meinung, die Religion sei ein phantastisches Gebilde, wird von der Wissenschaft in die Form gekleidet, daß sie eine **Schöpfung der Phantasie** sei. Allein diese ist ein durchaus normaler, sich auf den verschiedensten Gebieten geltend machender Trieb. Unbefriedigt von der realen Wirklichkeit entwirft sie Bilder einer idealen Welt. Diese aber sind zu einem Teil Wegweiser zu einer sich allmählich enthüllenden neuen Wirklichkeit. Wenn Plato Ideen annimmt, die hinter der Welt stehen und an ihre Spitze das Gute, Schöne, Wahre stellt, so ist im Kern hier eine Realität beschrieben, die der Phantasie einen Wirklichkeitswert gibt. Jeder Idealismus ist im Grund eine Schöpfung der Phantasie; und wenn man diesen nicht gänzlich für unbegründet erklären will, so hat man auch keinen Grund, aus dem Anteil der Phantasie an der Religion deren Unwirklichkeiten zu behaupten.

Die eigentlich modernen Meinungen bringen die Religion mit anormalen Erscheinungen im Geistesleben in Beziehung, wie **Halluzination und Vision.** Bei der ersten steigt aus dem Inneren des Menschen ohne jede Anregung von der Außenwelt ein Bild auf, dem Realität ohne Grund beigelegt wird. Bei der Vision werden Wirkungen aus der Umwelt umgedeutet und zu Erscheinungen einer andern Welt erhoben. Beide Vorgänge spielen in der Tat auch in der Religionsgeschichte eine Rolle, aber doch meistens nur bei mehr oder minder eigenartig veranlagten Menschen. Die große

Masse der Frommen kennt diese Erlebnisse nicht. Infolgedessen ist es mindestens nicht angängig, die Religion als Ganze auf Halluzinationen und Visionen zurückzuführen, wobei man außerdem noch die Frage aufwerfen kann, ob nicht auch durch diese Erscheinungen ein Wahrheitsgehalt vermittelt werden kann. — Wieder andre wollen sich die Religion aus **Suggestion** erklären, ohne sich darüber Rechenschaft zu geben, was deren Wesen ausmacht. Wird unter ihr nur die Aufnötigung geistiger Inhalte durch Objekte oder Personen der Außenwelt während unsers wachen Lebens verstanden, so ist damit nur ein völlig normaler und rein formaler Prozeß beschrieben, der auf allen Gebieten vorkommt und sich zur Wahrheitsfrage ganz neutral verhält. Suggestive Redegewalt kann in einer politischen Versammlung die Ueberzeugung eines Hörers umgestalten. Das spricht weder für noch gegen die Wahrheit der alten oder der neuen Ueberzeugung. Genau so kann auch die Religion einem Menschen zunächst durch suggestive Predigt vermittelt werden, ohne daß damit etwas für oder gegen ihre Wahrheit ausgesprochen ist. Versteht man dagegen unter Suggestion bestimmte abnorme Beeinflussungen auf Menschen, die sich in einem besondern Zustand der Hypnose befinden, so wird auch der schärfste Gegner der Religion nicht behaupten können, daß sie auf diesem Weg zustande komme und immer wieder übertragen werde. Auch der Versuch, die Religion aus dem Unbewußten zu erklären, führt nicht zum Ziel. In dieses streckt auch die Religion wie alle tieferen Mächte, Kunst und Sittlichkeit, ihre Wurzeln. Aber die Religion lebt ebenso im Bewußten. **Mithin trifft auch die letzte Kategorie der immanenten Erklärungsversuche: die Religion aus mehr oder minder anormalen Erscheinungen abzuleiten auf die Religion als Ganzes nicht zu und vermag ihr darum nicht den Charakter einer durchaus gesunden Erscheinung zu nehmen.**

2.

Sind damit alle Versuche die Religion zu erklären als nicht gelungen erwiesen, so gewinnt die **Behauptung der Religion selbst aus der Offenbarung Gottes zu stammen, ein ganz anders Gesicht, zumal diese völlig möglich und vorstellbar ist.** Je nach der Zustimmung zu einer mehr empiristischen oder mehr apriorischen Erkenntnistheorie kann man sich das Zustandekommen der göttlichen Uroffenbarung denken. Diese hat im Grund keinen andern Inhalt als das Wesen der Religion, Gott und seinen Willen zur Gemeinschaft zu offenbaren. Für die Aufnahme dieser Erkenntnis muß der Mensch innerlich vorbereitet gewesen sein. Negativ besteht diese Vorbereitung in der Unbefriedigung durch alle Güter und Erkenntnisse dieser Welt. Positiv hat der menschliche Geist die Anlage zum Unendlichen, Absoluten, Idealen mitbekommen. Durch alles

das entsteht aber von selbst keine wirkliche Religion. Wenn aber die Gottheit sich offenbarte, fand sie in diesen Anlagen ein inneres Echo. Nun war erschienen, was den menschlichen Geist wirklich befriedigte, jetzt stand das dunkelgeahnte Ideal vor ihm. Die göttliche Offenbarung aber kann nicht nur zustandekommen durch eine unvermittelte Verbindung mit dem Göttlichen. Sie bediente sich vielmehr gerade in alten Tagen der Naturerscheinungen, auch der furchterregenden. Zu einzelnen kam die Gottheit auch im Traum in Halluzinationen, Visionen, Suggestionen. Gott bediente sich aller, gerade auch äußerer Mittel: Weg hat er allerwegen, an Mitteln fehlt's ihm nicht.

So kam die göttliche Offenbarung durch äußere Vermittlungen in das Innere und zündete hier, weil die entsprechenden seelischen Voraussetzungen gegeben waren. Aber diese seelischen Funktionen wären niemals aktualisiert worden, wenn sie nicht die Offenbarung des lebendigen Gottes durch irdische Vermittlung in Bewegung gesetzt hätte. Von ihrer Wirklichkeit kann freilich niemand überzeugt werden, sondern nur der Fromme, der selbst noch in der Gegenwart Offenbarung erlebt, und der dadurch zugleich Verständnis und Glauben für die Bekundung Gottes in den großen geschichtlichen Vermittlern der Offenbarung gewinnt.

In früheren Zeiten glaubte man allgemein und logisch zwingend die Existenz Gottes durch die sogenannten **Gottesbeweise** erhärten zu können. In ihrer eigenständigen und rationalzwingenden Geltung sind sie durch Kant beseitigt, der damit der Religion einen Dienst leistete, weil diese jetzt nicht mehr allein durch den Verstand andemonstriert werden konnte, sondern Mitbeteiligung des Gemüts und Willens verlangte. Anderseits aber haben die Gottesbeweise immer wieder eine Art von Auferstehung erlebt. **Für den religiösen Menschen kommen sie nur als nachträgliche Unterstützung seiner Glaubensgewißheit in Betracht.** Wenn der menschliche Geist von jeher bis heute immer wieder Spuren Gottes in der Welt findet, so würde er das nicht tun, wenn nicht in der Welt tatsächlich Ansätze für den Gedanken an Gott gegeben werden. Der Trieb zu einer „prima causa" vorzudringen, legt immer wieder mit dem kosmologischen Beweis nahe, in Gott dem Schöpfer diese Ursache zu sehen. Der Blick auf zielstrebige Einrichtungen in der Wirklichkeit lenkt auf Gott als letztes höchstes Ziel hin, wie es im theologischen Beweis geschieht. Die Wahrheit der Religion ruht zwar in sich selbst, aber gerade darum ist sie auch für jedes von außen kommende Zeugnis empfänglich. — Wesen, Wert und Wahrheit der Religion sind damit gegenüber allen Angriffen richtig verstanden und in ihrer Gültigkeit aufrechterhalten. Das kommt auch dem Christentum zu Gute.

EDITORIALS

† PROFESSOR PHILIP VOLLMER, PH.D., D.D. †

There were perhaps very few pastors in the Synod who had a keener and more personal sense of loss when they heard of the death of Professor Vollmer, on Dec. 10th of last year, than the Editor of the Theological Magazine. Only a few days before he was taken from us, Dr. Vollmer had dictated a letter in which he advised the laymen of our churches to make their pastors a Christmas present of a year's subscription to the Magazine (see in the "Prospectus for 1930" in the January number). And he had promised three articles for the Magazine in 1930 (see also in the "Prospectus"). His support of the Magazine was so unfailing that whenever we were a little short on material for any particular number, we turned to him—and never in vain, even on the shortest notice. Not only that. We had had a great many conversations with him about the Magazine and about other matters. We did not always agree with him, but we always benefitted by the exchange of opinion. Besides, we found him unusually sympathetic in troubled situations. During the General Conference at Rochester we had a long talk with him about personal matters that were agitating us very considerably. We found in him a kindness, an intelligent understanding, a personal interest that were exceedingly soothing and helpful to us. In later letters he referred occasionally to it, and his advice was just as sound as it was tactful and warmhearted. On that evening at Rochester we induced him to go with us to a German recital of "Nathan the Wise," given by a single actor. The performance was a masterpiece, and Dr. Vollmer afterwards expressed his gratitude that we had been instrumental in giving him such an intellectual and artistic enjoyment.

A partial list of Dr. Vollmer's contributions to the Magazine reads as follows: Importance of the German Element in the United States; Stockholm and the Kingdom of God; Infant Baptism; Three Essentials for a Successful Ministry; Theology and Practice of Confirmation; Inspirational Value of the Study of Church History; the Heidelberg Catechism; Importance of the Social Sciences; How to preach the Social Gospel; the Church in Politics. The articles promised for 1930 were: Economic Security for Old Age a Demand of True Christianity; The Urgent Need of a more Thorough Conversion of the Church to Christ (to his So-

cial Program); Is the Second Coming of Christ a Catastrophic Event or a Historical Process?

One sees that Vollmer dealt with a variety of subjects as his course of training, his particular study or his theological position suggested them. His one great preference, however, was the Social Gospel. He had given his heart to this ever since he had specialized in it as a resident student at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia (1891-1893). When he entered the Faculty of Eden Seminary in 1922, his outside lectures on the Social Gospel were the thing that attracted the greatest attention. The writer remembers distinctly the enthusiasm with which his wife spoke of a course of Vollmer lectures which she attended at a national Convention of our Womens' Union. The social gospel was then a new thing, the new wine they had never tasted before. He could never give them enough of it, she said, they could have listened for hours. Of course, the Social Gospel has now found lodgment on Evangelical soil, but Vollmer has been one of its main promoters. His book on New Testament Sociology we consider a most valuable monography in this field, it is written in popular style, but well considered and arranged, comprehensive in treatment: as a text book. we should say, hard to surpass.

Now he has been called hence, prematurely, we are apt to think. He died as the result of a cold, so it seemed, but really because of heart trouble. His heart must have been bad for years, without his even knowing it or ever doing anything for it. Those who saw him at the General Conference noticed in him no decline of health and strength. We counted on his being a power for good in our Synod for years to come. It was not so to be. The commission for Social Service whose executive secretary he was, will surely miss him (the new Constitution provides for no such commission, though). The Brotherhoods and Ladies' Aid Societies, the Summer school at Dunkirk will miss him. In many places will people look for his familiar figure, his smiling face and his helpful discussions. The Editor of the Magazine, as stated before, feels that he is almost more stricken than any. Who will step in Dr. Vollmer's place as far as this paper is concerned?

He is in the land of light, so we trust. Let us, then, calm our hearts and consider: God calls the workman away in due time. but the work goes on.

TWO HUNDRED PROTESTANT MINISTERS AT THE LORD'S TABLE

On the last day of the old year two hundred Protestant ministers of different denominations gathered here in our city (Cleveland, O.) around the Lord's table to partake of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. This was not the first Holy Communion we had had together; for some years we have tried to express in this manner that, in spite of differences of creed and custom, it is possible to feel that we are all members of the body of Christ. Of course, similar "corporate communions" (here the organization represented was the ministers of the Federated churches of the city) have been held elsewhere. Last year, at the great Pastors' Convention at Columbus, O., over one thousand united at the Lord's table. At this writing it is too early to report of this year's Pastors' Convention, where possibly over 1500 ministers will be present for a period of discussion and worship.

The thing to be emphasized today is not the question of the numbers of ministers or denominations represented, but *the nature of the communion service* used at this occasion. At the Pastors' Convention last year old Dr. Thompson, president emeritus of Ohio State, presided at the service. He used a congregational form of communion service. To us this service did not express the fulness of thought contained for us in the Lord's Supper. There was no confessional, no absolution; no mention of the fact that the sacrament is a means of grace, or an aid to faith. It was only stressed that to partake of the Lord's last meal requires a rededication of ourselves to his service and exemplifies the spiritual unity of all his believers. In other words, the human factor was in the foreground. The form of service used expressed not what the Lord did and does for us, but what we do for him. No wonder we had a feeling of a very serious depletion of the meaning of the Communion.

This year, on the other hand, at the Cleveland Communion, a member of the United Lutheran Church had worked out the form of worship. While "carefully avoiding controversial statements about the Lord's Supper, the atonement, etc." (words used in the printed copies), the whole service was based on the scriptures. It was to a great extent the form we use in the preparation and administration of the Lord's Supper. There were the three questions as to repentance, faith and willingness to lead a new life. Then followed, however, not the declaration of absolution. It went on, "Then, brethren, *let us pray for* the forgiveness of our sins, and for the coming of Christ's Kingdom in us, and in all men." Then ensued the "Consecration of the Elements" (so in the printed

copy). Then the administration of the Lord's Supper in the well known scripture words. Finally the closing prayer expressed "the assurance of our participation in the salvation of Christ which had come to us through this blessed sacrament."

It stands to reason that we Evangelicals felt more at home at this service than last year at Columbus. But all others manifested a very devout spirit although we saw some there whose theology was to us of the washed-out type of rationalism. Then also, the Baptist minister, who had the sermon, and preached on "Let us not grow weary in well-doing," did not seem to know what ideas a communion sermon should properly elucidate and emphasize.

Now what does all this seem to show? It shows that a communion service of this kind can never count on fully satisfying everybody. To some it expresses too little of what they see in it; to others it goes too far. If, therefore, a person can only feel at home there if his own creed and custom is fully adhered to, he had better stay away; and such is the position of most Lutherans. If, however, we seek fellowship even with those who differ from us in many respects, such a communion service satisfies this desire for an expression of the unity of all believers. Naturally, if the service used ignored or contradicted essential parts of our faith we could not participate. If it did not contain all that we find in the sacrament, but expressed some of the vital features we see in it, we could share in it but would by no means give up even the least of the scriptural teachings our own training has taught us to discover in the Lord's Communion.

THE 1900TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

The year 1930 is a year of anniversaries in several respects. For one thing, the Augsburg Confession was prepared and submitted to the emperor Charles V. and the diet in 1530 at Augsburg. This confession was the work of Melanchthon and sought to show that the church as reformed by Luther was in essential harmony with the church of the early centuries and the ecumenical creeds, and in every way grounded upon the scriptures (See the article by Dr. Schieler in this number). That was 400 years ago.

The other anniversary takes us back into a still hoarier and holier past, into the time of Christ's ministry itself and the founding of his church. If, according to competent scholarship, the birth of Christ occurred 3 or 4 years before the beginning of the Christian Era, then 1930 is the 1900th anniversary of the birth of the Christian church. We would rather use the word "birth"

than "founding." Christ himself likens the spiritual change in the individual, his becoming a new man, rather to a birth brought about by the Spirit's action than to the conscious and deliberate doing of man or men. The account of the origin of the Church in Acts 2 is as mysterious as it is thrilling. The elemental forces of wind and fire are used to symbolize the event, for as spontaneous, inexplicable and irresistible as they, is the Spirit of God that acted on the souls of men then and empowered them not only to be children of God but to engender in their hearers the same faith and spiritual rebirth.

It is easy and natural, perhaps, for the men of "enlightened" ages to minimize and rationalize the things told in the 2nd of Acts, to explain them as the desire of church men to idealize their glorious past, to reduce to the mere "enthusiasm" of an excitable race what they considered the genuine intervention of a divine agent, to smile indulgently at the credulity of a pre-scientific age. It is not so easy, though, to account for the tremendous force of the new movement and for the death-defying heroism of the Christians.

As we look back today upon the far distant birth of the Christian church, as we survey its history, its influence, its power to Christianize a world, its unique rank in the social forces of the past, and, at the same time, its imperfections, its failures and its rather perplexed and doubtful positions at the present time, there steals over us a wistful longing to rediscover the living fountains of its former power.

It is clear that as the divine Spirit called it into being, the Spirit alone can breathe new life into it. The Saviour in speaking to Nicodemus about spiritual regeneration, says, "the wind bloweth where it listeth." It seems as though he wanted to impress on us the futility of attempting to get the Spirit to act for us and the church. Still it cannot be so, for, insoluble though the interaction of divine will and human freedom seems to be, did he not give his disciples definite promise that if they did their part God would do his? And was not their part "to continue in Jerusalem and wait for the outpouring from above?" And they did continue with one accord in prayer and supplication, and when the day of Pentecost had fully come they were all filled and the church at once sprang into life.

That was God's way then, it will be his way now. The Federal Council makes some suggestions as to how to observe this year and how to prepare the way for new experience. It recommends a church attendance campaign; the reading of Luke and Acts; prayer meetings between Ascension Day and Pentecost and "Ingatherings" afterwards (see Ev. Herald, Dec. 26, 1929). In short, Scrip-

ture study and prayer and personal evangelism are laid upon us as sacred obligations. We endorse that. But following the example of the first Chrsitians we would say above all, "Let us continue with one accord in prayer and supplication!" Then the Spirit will move. How much, we don't know, but such prayers will be answered, abundantly, and without a doubt.

Heilsgeschichte

Der Begriff der Heilsgeschichte nahm im Glauben unsrer Väter eine besondre Stellung ein. Das Fundament ihres christlichen Lebens fanden sie in der Heilsoffenbarung, wie sie im Alten Testament vorbereitet und in Christo erfüllt war. In Christo war die Erlösung von Menschheit vollbracht. Seine Fleischwerdung, sein sühnender Tod, seine Auferstehung und Erhöhung zur Rechten Gottes waren die **Heilstatsachen,** auf denen ihr Glaube ruhte. Natürlich sahen sie ihr Heil, ihre Erlösung nicht in der bloßen Anerkennung dieser historischen Tatsachen. Vielmehr wurde das Heil in Christo ihr Besitz durch den geistgewirkten, persönlichen Glauben. In solchem Glauben tat sich ihnen der Quell der Wiedergeburt auf. Pietisten wie sie waren, kamen sie zur Heilsgewißheit durch geistliche **Erfahrung.** Es ist bekannt, daß diese Betonung der persönlichen Heilserfahrung ein Hauptmoment in der sogenannten „Erlanger Theologie" bildete. Unsre Väter lebten in der Zeit vor Hofmann und Frank, aber in diesem Punkt waren sie durchaus ihre Geistesverwandten.

Der Pietismus hatte seine Schranken. Er betonte das Gefühlsmäßige zu sehr und schöpfte aus der Erfahrung Dinge, die man nicht aus ihr entnehmen kann, sondern bloß aus der Schrift. Er war, um mit E. Schaeder zu reden, zu einseitig christozentrisch und nicht genügend theozentrisch. Das ist, er sah in der Vergebung der Sünden alles und erkannte noch nicht, daß der Gnadenwille Gottes das ganze menschliche Leben umfaßt, seine Kultur, Wissenschaft, die Gestaltung des politischen und industriellen Lebens usw. Seine Theologie war wesentlich individualistisch, sein Reichsgottesstandpunkt beschränkte sich auf Kirche und Mission. Die Durchsäuerung des ganzen Menschenlebens mit dem Evangelium Christi stand noch nicht auf seinem Programm. So kam es, daß er durch die Entwicklung der Reichsgottesidee beiseite geschoben wurde, besonders in unserm Land. Seine Geringschätzung oder Nichtbeachtung der Wissenschaft entfremdete ihm die Mitwelt. Unsre Zeit hat sich mit rückhaltloser Begeisterung der Erforschung des verstandesmäßig Erkennbaren hingegeben. Selbst der Theologe interessiert sich mehr für Biologie, Psychologie und Soziologie als für Theo-

logie im eigentlichen Sinn. Die Bücher, die wie Pilze aus der Erde schießen und zweifellos dem allgemeinen Bedürfnisse entsprechen, beschäftigen sich mit dem Widerstreit von Wissenschaft und Religion. Dabei wird der Religion immer mehr Boden abgegraben. Selbst die Gottesidee soll die Theologie sich von der Wissenschaft neuformulieren lassen. Die Absolutheit Jesu kann vor der wissenschaftlichen Kritik nicht standhalten. Die Religion liefert Gefühlswärme und sittliche Ideale. Die Idee, daß Christus das Heil „beschafft" habe, daß sein Leben **Heilstatsachen** darbiete, scheint dem modernen Geist eine absurde Antiquität. Mit Lessing und Hegel ist man der Ueberzeugung, daß „absolute Vernunftwahrheiten nicht durch zufällige Geschichtstatsachen erhärtet werden können," daß es „nicht die Weise der Idee ist, sich ganz in ein Individuum zu ergießen."

Dazu kommt als eine weitere Signatur unsrer Zeit, daß sie durchaus **praktisch gerichtet** ist. Sie hat es mit der Gegenwart zu tun. Geschichte beschäftigt sich mit der Vergangenheit, wir aber müssen die Aufgaben der Gegenwart lösen. Jesus lebte vor 1900 Jahren. Ohne Zweifel ist sein Einfluß noch heute unmeßbar groß, aber es sind nicht seine Natur, seine Versöhnung, seine leibliche Auferstehung, die ihn noch heute uns wichtig machen, sondern sein Geist, seine Liebe, sein Charakter, seine Gesinnung. Seine „Ideale" von Menschenliebe und Vertrauen zur Menschennatur sind es, die auf allen Gebieten wirksam werden müssen, soll anders die Welt frei werden von Haß und Unrecht und Unterdrückung. Zu diesem wird von einigen noch sein Gottesglaube hinzugefügt: Daß ein liebender Vater auf unsrer Seite steht, war Jesu Ueberzeugung. Er mag sich darin geirrt haben, sagte kürzlich ein bekannter Theologe von New England, aber „viele von uns" halten an diesem Glauben fest.

Sollen wir denn nun angesichts dessen die Segel streichen? Sollen wir unser „pietistisches Erbe" in der Rumpelkammer unterbringen, oder es zu Zeiten hervorholen und wie einen Liebesbrief, den wir vor vielen Jahren geschrieben, zur allgemeinen Ergötzung der Familie unterbreiten, damit sie sehen, war für ein sentimentaler Gefühlsmensch der Vater seiner Zeit gewesen ist?

Wir denken nicht. Es ist gut, heilsam und nötig, nach dem Geist Christi zu trachten und Früchte unsers Glaubens zu erwarten und zu fordern. Es ist nötig, aus der pietistischen Enge und Beschränktheit herauszuwachsen. Es ist unerläßlich, die Zeichen der Zeit zu erkennen und die Aufgaben der Zeit zu lösen.

Aber es ist ein großer Fehler, sich so zu halten, als wenn man von selbst des Heil Gottes und seinen Frieden besitzen könnte, ohne daß man es ernstlich sucht und in Christo findet. Die Apostel

gingen aus in die Welt mit der Verkündigung der Heilstatsache seiner Auferstehung wie seiner Versöhnung. Paulus, der große Welteroberer, nennt sein Amt ein Amt der Versöhnung, meinend, daß die Gemeinschaft mit Gott der Menschheit in Christo aufgetan ist, durch sein Leben, Sterben, Auferstehen. Mit dieser Botschaft hat er Großartiges geleistet. Manche sagen, er hat das einfache Evangelium Christi zu einer Theologie gemacht und diese seine Theologie der Kirche als ein unheilvolles Erbe hinterlassen, das sie erst heute abzustoßen beginnt. Welch lästerliche Verleumdung! Die Größten der Kirchengeschichte haben an Paulus gelernt, sich Gottes zu bemächtigen und wahrlich nicht zum Schaden von Kirche und Welt.

Bleiben wir stehen auf den Tatsachen, die unser Heil begründet haben. Es wird uns weder die Augen verbinden, daß wir unsre Zeit nicht verstehen, noch die Hände lässig machen, daß wir nicht in Dienst stellen unsre Zeit und Kraft für Kirche und Volk.

Here are some *unsolicited* letters to the Editor, which you will read with interest.

Cincinnati, Ohio, den 11. Januar 1930

Rev. Dr. H. Kamphausen,
9807 Cudell Ave.,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Sehr verehrter Herr Doktor und lieber Bruder!

Das „Theological Magazine" ist mir so oft es erscheint ein hoch willkommener Freund. Ich kann nicht umhin, es Ihnen einmal zu sagen, daß ich es sehr hoch schätze. Die Artikel sind äußerst interessant und gediegen; sie haben ja eine vortreffliche Reihe von Korrespondenten auf beiden Seiten des Ozeans und wissen den Stoff zu beschaffen, der aktuell ist und den allgemeinsten Interessen dient.

Vor allem möchte ich Ihnen meine Anerkennung über das aussprechen, was Sie selber schreiben. Und hier verdienen wohl in erster Linie Ihre ausgezeichneten Rezensionen Erwähnung. Hier muß ich Sie tatsächlich bewundern. Wo nehmen Sie die Zeit her bei Ihrer pastoralen und übrigen, editoriellen, Arbeit, alle diese Bücher zu lesen, so sorgfältig zu lesen? Ihr Tag muß mehr Stunden haben als der meine. Oder haben Sie am Ende die Wunderbrille aufgetrieben und in Ihren Besitz gebracht, mit welcher Joseph Smith die goldenen Platten des Buches Mormon „entziffert" hat — daß Sie im Lesen hexen können? Sie leisten uns tatsächlich mit diesen trefflichen Rezensionen einen sehr wertvollen

Dienst, für den ich Ihnen einmal aufrichtig danken möchte. — Ich bewundere auch Ihren klaren Blick in „rebus theologicis et philosophicis" und „last not least" Ihren vortrefflichen englischen Stil. Ihr theologischer Standpunkt ist im wesentlichen der meine, obschon ich hie und da allzugern mit Ihnen über dieses und jenes ein wenig disputieren möchte. Sie scheinen mir ungefähr hin zu gehören, wo ich stehe, zwischen Fundamentalismus und Modernismus (in „malam partem" gedacht) drinnen. Ihr Bericht von der Lutheranerfeier in Cleveland auf Seite 52 ist mir recht zu Herzen gegangen. Die Glaubenstreue der Lutheraner verdient alle Anerkennung. Im Uebrigen stimme ich Ihnen völlig bei in dem, was Sie sagen von der Ueberschätzung des Lutherischen Katechismus und in der Unterschätzung der sozialen Aufgabe der Kirche.

Zum Schluß recht herzlichen kollegialischen Brudergruß, auch eine höfliche Empfehlung an Frau Doktor.

Ihr mitverbundener

A. F. Bucher.

R. R. 1, Lynnville, Ind., den 6. Januar 1930.

Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol.,
9807 Cudell Ave.,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Lieber Bruder Kamphausen!

Soeben habe ich die neueste Nummer des „Theological Magazine" von Ihren Editorials bis zum Schluß, Ihre Bücherbesprechungen mit einbegriffen durchgelesen. Dieser Teil der Hefte ist meistens das Erste, das ich lese. Ich habe alles mit immer mehr steigender Genugtuung gelesen, in Bezug auf die Auswahl der Gegenstände, die Trefflichkeit Ihres Urteils und die Art, in der Sie es aussprechen deutsch oder englisch. Ich möchte gern noch mehr sagen, fürchte aber, es möchte als Schmeichelei aufgefaßt werden. Ich wünsche aber, daß es jeder Synodale erkennen möchte, was wir an unserm „Theological Magazine" und an seinem Redakteur haben.

In brüderlicher Liebe Ihr

E. G. Aldinger.

January 12, 1930.

Dr. H. Kamphausen,
9807 Cudell Ave.,
Cleveland, Ohio.

My dear Doctor:

I have been a reader of the "Theological Magazine" for thirty years; since I am in the ministry. The periodical, in my humble

opinion, has always been good, but it seems to me it is better now than ever.

I have been wanting to tell you this for a long time, but did not get to it. Now I cannot restrain myself any longer, I must tell you.

The "Magazine" is most interesting, very stimulating and truly Evangelical in spirit. As a minister it is my favorite magazine. I invariably read it from cover to cover. In the recent issue I found the articles by Professor Gruetzmacher and Rev. T. Kugler most helpful. Your editorials and your book reviews are always good. I usually read them first.

Allow me to compliment you on the splendid work you are doing in the "Magazine," to thank you for the benefits which I have derived by reading it and to express the hope that you may remain its editor for many years to come.

Fraternally yours,

Frederick H. Krafft.

We add a solicited expression which came too late for January number.—*Ed.*

Rev. H. Kamphausen, D.D.
9807 Cudell Avenue,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Dear Doctor Kamphausen:

I regret very much that I left both of your recent letters unanswered for so long a time. The first one arrived at a time when I was snowed under with work; I put it aside for early attention, instead of answering it immediately. And you know what happens to letters filed in that way.

I do not see how any recommendation of mine could be of value to the Magazine but I am very glad to say that our Magazine compares very favorably with the theological journals of other American denominations, that it stimulates theological thinking and that it offers a much-needed counter-weight against the constant tendency of the churches to relegate theology into the background while they emphasize only the practical.

I wish you and the Magazine a New Year of rich blessing in your work for the church.

Very cordially yours,

H. R. Niebuhr.

Dec. 19, 1929.

The Christian World

Union Day in Scotland

Impressive Scenes in Edenburgh

By Dr. T. Hywel Hughes, in *The Christian World*

[*The Church of Scotland and the United Free Church have merged into one body after eighty years of separation. This article tells the story of the day when the Union was consummated.*]

"Yea, the sparrow hath found her a nest." These words must have flashed on many minds in the vast assembly—they did on mine—when they saw a sparrow flying timidly among the drapings of the great hall, and alighting almost over the head of the new Moderator of the United Assembly of the Scottish Church. Outside a fierce storm was raging, and the rain smote pitilessly on the glass roof of the hall, making it difficult to hear the Moderator's voice. But within there were brightness and a sense of joy at the consummation of a Union long worked for and sought with earnest prayer.

The platform party was rich in color, for besides the Duke and Duchess of York and their retinue, who occupied the center, there were the provosts of many towns in their ermine and gold, the law lords in their wigs and gowns, and the principals and professors of colleges and representatives of the seats of learning, one tall figure towering above all the others—that of Principal A. R. Henderson of Nottingham. Dr. Garvie was there as the presentative of the Congregational Union. Beyond was the great sea of faces, the Assembly delegates in front and the general public filling all the remaining space. Amplifiers had been fixed at points of vantage, so that even those at the farthest end could hear.

Impressive scenes had preceded the great gathering in the hall. The two Assemblies had marched from their respective halls, with the Moderators leading—the wind was so strong that it blew away the Moderators' hats—and when the two streams came together at the junction of High Street and Bank Street, as the Moderators were shaking hands, the crowd spontaneously burst forth into song. The noble Twenty-third Psalm and other well-known metrical Psalms were sung as the two assemblies marched together into Saint Giles Cathedral. There the Duke and Duches of York joined them in a short service of praise and thanksgiving.

At the Hall of Assemblies, as it was called, Principal Martin presided and read the prayers, his rich voice and deliberate utterance making every word clear throughout the great building. After the Assembly clerks had laid the minutes and the Plan of Union on the table, Lord Sands, in a very happy speech, moved the resolution—the final resolution—of Union. This was seconded by Dr. Drummond and carried

unanimously. Principal Martin then made a solemn declaration of the completed Union, and after this the two Moderators, standing one on either side of the Moderators' chair, joined hands and sealed the Union in a solemn pledge, and with this act and the singing of a Psalm, the Union was completed.

Dr. John White was elected as the first Moderator of the United Church, the ex-Moderators leading him in procession to the chair, after which the Commission of State appointing the Duke of York, as High Commissioner, was read, as well as a personal letter from the King, wishing all blessing on the United Church. The Duke of York gave a short address.

Then Dr. White delivered his address as Moderator. Its prevailing note was one of optimistic faith in the possibilities and the future of the new Church. The most significant passage was that in which he looked forward to the coming together of all the Presbyterian bodies in Scotland, including the present minority, and even to a larger union, into which the non-Presbyterian bodies may come without sacrificing any of their principles or surrendering their past heritage. He even envisaged a union with the Episcopal Church, although he frankly acknowledged the difficulties in this case. Another passage that told was that in which he acknowledged the services of women to the Church and their place in the religious life of the land; though, as one reflected, he had to admit that never as yet had a woman been elected as a member of the Assembly, nor as an elder of any of the churches, and that the ministry was as yet closed to them in spite of all the fine service they were rendering to the Church.

It was a great gathering, although to many there seemed some alien elements in the presence of the military, with its pomp and show, and in an occasional touch of excessive ecclesiasticism. Perhaps one may say also that the whole procedure was so well organized and staged that it lacked spontaneity and life.

At the evening meeting greetings were brought from representatives of a large number of religious bodies, and here the Archbishop of Canterbury made a very eloquent and moving speech. There was a personal touch in his reference to his own connection with the Church of Scotland and to his father as Dr. White's predecessor at the Barony Church. He spoke wistfully of the larger freedom which the Church in Scotland enjoyed, and wished it were so in the Church of England. There was a fine and fervent spirit in his utterance as he expressed his hope for a larger and more comprehensive union of the churches. Almost all the speakers dwelt on this, and it was the line which Dr. Garvie took in speaking for the Congregational Union, as well as the Rev. M. E. Aubrey on behalf of the Baptist Union.

As one reflected on the gatherings afterwards and recalled the many fine utterances on union, it was somewhat sad to realize that this very Union has resulted in a minority refusing to join, and doing so on strong conscientious grounds. It seemed as if the spirit of one great Church were to be kept alive only in this way. And on Wed-

nesday afternoon, at the very hour of the Union, this little group was forming itself into an Assembly and electing its Moderator in the person of the Rev. James Barr, M.P. I had the privilege of being present at their evening meeting in Glasgow, a gathering of nearly 3,000 in the Saint Andrew's Hall. The difference of atmosphere was very striking. Here were a deep spirit of earnestness, a sense of being up against grim realities, a resolute determination to make sacrifices for the cause and an enthusiasm that was infectious. There was no mistaking the spiritual power of the meeting, and the Moderator's address was a noble assertion of freedom—freedom from creedal tests, freedom from state patronage and aid, freedom from sacramentarianism and ecclessiasticism. There was courage, too, in the closing passage, in which he state that this Church would stand for three positions: the abolition of war; better houses and social conditions for the poor; and temperance. It was to be a Church of the people for the people.

I left feeling that there were life and spiritual exaltation in the meeting, and that the cause of freedom and the spirit of the Free Churches were safe in Scotland.

The Larger Fellowship (Congregationalists and Union)

An address delivered at the Ohio State Conference

DAN F. BRADLEY

It gives me an especial thrill to participate in this love feast with people who really care for us. It has been my good fortune to serve for many years as a rather quiet member of our National Council's Commission on Inter-Church Relations: first under the chairmanship of the late venerable, irenic scholar, Dr. Newman Smythe of New Haven, and later under the leadership of Dr. Frank Sanders, who has devoted months of study and conference with various groups of denominational leaders—manifesting a spirit of friedliness and good sense quite rare among ecclesiastics. In spite of these labors of two of our finest leaders —the results have been, until now, disappointing.

Twenty-two years ago we negotiated with the United Brethren and Methodist Protestant with a view to consolidating our three bodies. A great meeting of delegates assembled at Dayton. We were guests of the United Brethren, and our Dr. Douglas Mackenzie framed a statement of views which was unanimously adopted with pious fervor. That statement is today our Ohio basis for interpretation of our faith. But when the enthusiasm of the moonlight of a June evening faced the stern midday blaze of machine-cranking secretaries on the one hand and hard-boiled machine-worshiping bishops on the other, there grew up a coldness and an emphasis of difficulties, and a calling of unpleasant names, Sabellian, Manichaean, to say nothing of Unitarian and Universalist, so that the whole project was quietly allowed to fade away. It was a Mid-West project, and the Easterners had little interest in it.

Again, just before the World War, there arose an enthuiasm to become intimate with the Episcopalians. This was an Eastern interest

centering about Boston and New Haven, growing out of the beautiful service rendered by the church by Phillips Brooks. Who would not be eager to affiliate with a church where such rare souls as Brooks and Lawrence were the gracious Bishops? The formula of union only required the simple process of securing for our Congregational ministers true "tactual" ordination by the laying on of hands of our men by some bishop of the Anglican communion. To many of our men the proposition was ridiculous. What grace had any bishop to give to such prophets as Geogre Gordon or Charles Jefferson through the "tactual" ordination? Nevertheless the thing was to be tried. A victim, professor at Yale, Congregationally ordained, was offered up to the Episcopal Bishop of Connecticut. But that worthy ecclesiast saw through the camouflage and declined to be a part of the foolish scheme. So *that* fell through after a wordy torrent of animadversion. Dr. Herring, our National Council Secretary, was deeply disappointed by the fiasco, in which he, with Dr. Nehemiah Boynton, had so great an interest.

Then came our late lamented effort to join our free ideas with the heavy-hued Calvinism of the Presbyterians. Some of us had a real hope that liberalism in the Presbyterian Church had gone so far that, through Union Seminary and the Chicago progressive element, there would be a chance to unite our churches on equal terms in given areas, although the General Assembly might not agree to merge all its concerns with ours. We were further encouraged because the Federal Council had moved far in the direction of a broader fellowship, and in the leadership of that Federal Council there were several side-steppers of great agility who belonged to us, and to the Presbyterian fold as well.

But the Fundamentalist-Modernist tornado broke loose, and the prospect of such sturdy orthodoxarians as Dr. MacCartney and Dr. Mark Mathews sitting at the same Lord's table with Dr. Charles R. Brown and Dr. Carl Patton became gradually dim and faded. The beginnings made in Cleveland were speedily checked and withdrawn, and there came a word to us from the Presbytery that they would continue to love us—very far off.

In all of these instances the failure to unite has arisen not so much from fundamental differences as from the possession of ancient bric-a-brac, the disposition of which has always been a puzzle. No intelligent Presbyterian that I have talked with for thirty years cares a tinker's epithet about the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechism—yet we can not unite *without* the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechism. Everybody knows it hangs like a millstone about the neck of Protestantism, yet they like to have it around anyway. We are comforted by the thought that the Presbyterians have also given the Methodists the mitten.

Then about two years ago we picked up the very attractive Universalists—charming people. We had an active courtship, and at Omaha we told them of our warm regard, and made them feel that our old emphasis on a penal institution for unshriven souls in the life beyond no longer interested us. They promptly responded to our ad-

vances and everything looked lovely for an early wedlock, when they discovered that they had a date, or something to the same effect, with the Unitarians, and the Unitarians objected rather vigorously to their philandering around with us. Whereupon any further engagements with us became embarrassing. They still protest their admiration for us, and we have exhausted our vocabulary of affection on them. But when it comes to a date with us, the injunction of the Unitarians seems to hold.

In the midst of our gloom—wanting to get married to somebody, and everybody giving us the cold shoulder—come these Christians. Here is a new thrill. It's the real thing. Here is no modern flapper, painted and powdered. Neither is here an ancient dame with mechanical curls and stern, hatchet-faced front. Here is a comely, cuddly, country damself with a smile, healthy, friendly, not figuring too closely —just a natural sweet-heart, a sort of combination of Mary Pickford and Frances Willard—whose greeting makes the springtime look like a piker. We are glad the others turned us down, now that she is here.

Seriously, the Christians are our kind. We hope they feel that we are their kind. Our fellowship is as natural as the gentle moving of a zephyr. We are asking neither to give up anything, nor are we seeking to get anything but love. The union of our churches is but a development of the life of our gospel. We like each other. And because we do, we mutually want the other to have everything we have got. We want a real marriage, not some companionate abortion. We want the wedding day to come soon; the sooner, the sweeter. We want no detail of bargaining and trading. We want to go to keeping house with whatever we have, and calling everything our common property—colleges, missionary societies, furniture for functioning. And we shall not be too curious about any idiosyncrasies the other ma yhavé. And we will keep out of our vocabularies Sabellian, Cyprian, Manichaean, Sublapsarian and Supralapsarian. We shall all be Christians together, Congregationalists together, but above all, lovers together of our Lord, who is the Christ.—*From the Congregationalist.*

A Sunday in Berlin

By the Rev. William Ross, B.D., *Edinburgh*
Reprinted from "The British Weekly"

To one who has not seen Berlin for thirty odd years the change in its atmosphere and in those outward things by which its atmosphere is created makes a deep and not unpleasant dint in one's mind.

Thirty years ago the pavements of Unter den Linden seemed to be the peculiar property of those handsome, haughty, monocled, self-conscious officers who displayed their sartorial and martial glories to an admiring but uncomfortable public. Unhappy he who should come into collision with an officer. The Army was the State, and the "State could do no wrong." Here and there on the quiet streets of Potsdam an officer may still be seen, but his demeanor is humble, almost apolo-

getic. He may even ride a push-bike, and if you are puzzled about your way and speak to him, he will dismount and salute, courteously reply, and salute again. Gone are the swift horses that cantered up and down the Rotten Rows of Unter den Linden. No change in Berlin is more significant than this, that these riding tracks in the middle of the principal street have disappeared and now add to the breadth of the foot and carriage-ways. Gone, too, the swift pair of horses that emerged from the court of the Palace and raced to the Brandenburgher Tor, the All-Highest bowing to everyone he passed. "How are the mighty fallen and the weapons of war have perished!"

Sunday in Berlin is a happy surprise. For the first three-quarters of it it is a day of calm. Shops and places of business, with few exceptions, mostly Hebrew, are closed. Ten o'clock on Sunday morning in Unter den Linden is quieter than ten o'clock in Princes street, Edinburgh. The only evidences of activity were the half-filled charabancs of the Weltreisebureau sleepily waiting for the other half to get out of bed.

The Cathedral

The Dom or Cathedral of Berlin close to the Royal Palace, with its gardens in front and its vast dome balanced on either side by two smaller domes, impresses the spectator by its size, its simplicity, its symmetry. It is seated for 1,960, and on Sunday morning last every seat was filled and hundreds stood in the aisles. The congregation was certainly not less than 2,500. "Every seat" must be qualified, for there is one gallery oppcsite chancel and pulpit with forty-four chairs in which the Kaiser, his household and his guests used to sit, the most regular and perhaps not the least reverent of worshipers. That gallery is never used. It is seldom shown to visitors, but one of the many kindnesses extended to us in Berlin was the opening of the Kaiser Gallery to British feet. We sat where he sat, and the sadness of it all dimmed the sunshine of that glorious day. Hindenburg, the President of the Republic, mighty occupy that gallery, but he does not. His seat when he is present is a chair in the front row facing the altar. The artificer of the Hindenburg line is a shy man—who would have thought it?

The acoustics of the Dom are excellent, but that excellence is a triumph of ingenuity. The architect conquered and killed one of the worst echoes ever known. On the opening day in 1905, when the great organ, the gift of a member of the congregation, pealed forth in full diapason its opening doxology, the echo was intolerable. People put their fingers in their ears. The method by which that echo was conquered is, I believe, unique.

From the ceiling of the dome and down to the level of its base one million pieces of string weighed down by tiny bits of lead at the end are hung, some perpendicular, some interlacing, some arranged in the form of a cone. The same thing has been done in the alcove gal-

leries with which the cathedral is surrounded. The threads are not noticeable. It is only when the visitor is told of their presence and concentrates his gaze on the dome that he is able dimly to see that they are there. The sound waves are caught and absorbed in these threads and the echo is cured.

In this cathedral also there is perpetual sunshine. In the chancel there are three glorious windows—the Birth, Crucifixion, and the Resurrection—which radiate sunshine in the dullest day.

The secret of these windows lies with their creater, Anton von Werner, but they consist of three plates of glass, one blue, the other yellow and the third red. The colors are burned into the glass. The picture is only on the inmost or uppermost of the three. The effect of light passing through those tripple plates is marvelous; on the dullest day the windows shine as if the sun smote them in the face.

Dr. Doehring's Sermon

On Sunday morning the preacher was Dr. Doehring, the best preacher in Berlin I was told on Saturday, the best preacher in Germany I was told on Monday, the best preacher I think it has been my lot to listen to. Clear, cogent, logical thought, evangelical, rapid but distinct enunciation, forty-five minutes of powerful passionate appeal, holding his audience in the hollow of his hand.

His text was John 6: 63: "The words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life." "His words were, and are, and will be spirit out of God's spirit, life out of God's life. Were it not so one would have to explain two things—how these words abide in the same power as they possessed the day they were spoken; and how the floods of words day in day out spoken against them have not overwhelmed them, but have been overwhelmed by them. How is it that man can never be neutral to these words, and if he profess to be so, he proves speedily that he is not, for nothing is more obnoxious to these so-called neutrals than to listen to a frank and free confession of Christ. Such confessors they pronounce 'fanatic,' 'orthodox,' 'pietist,' and so on." "The word of the Cross is folly to those that are lost, to us who are saved it is the power of God." "Spirit and life are the essential predicates of the living God." A striking passage followed in which a clear distinction was drawn between the spirit of human knowledge which after mature reflection proceeds from the *outside inward*, but never reaches the innermost of our being. The Holy Spirit on the other hand is experienced in the deepest depths of our being, and works from the *center outward* to the circumference. "The living God and Father of Jesus Christ goes always to the innermost, always to the whole being, always to the center."

The service was followed by the Lord's Supper tenderly and beautifully dispensed. To each communicant the same word was spoken: "Fear not, I am with thee." What a powerful place the Lord's Table is!

The Election of a New Presiding Bishop (for Episcopal Church)

Bishop Anderson of Chicago Chosen—Rev. S. Harrington Littell Named for Honolulu See

By the Rt. Rev. H. P. Almon Abbott, D.D., *Bishop of Lexington*

Washington, D. C., November 14, 1929.

Two bishops who had received the highest number of votes, with their arms around one another, each assuring his brother with a smile that the other would be the victor in the battle of ballots, was a fitting prelude to the breaking of a seeming deadlock which resulted in the election of the Rt. Rev. Charles Palmerston Anderson, D.D., Bishop of Chicago, as the Presiding Bishop of the Church. It was suggestive of the spirit of good fellowship which characterized the entire meeting of the House of Bishops in the city of Washington yesterday. Anything more divorced from the atmosphere of a political convention it would have been difficult, nay, altogether impossible, to conceive. The attitude of the Bishop of Rhode Island and the Bishop of Virginia was symptomatic of the attitude maintained throughout the entire proceedings.

Ninety-four bishops, out of a total of 135 bishops entitled to vote, were gathered together from all parts of the United States for the purpose of electing a Presiding Bishop and a bishop for the missionary jurisdiction of Honolulu, and they were gathered together "in the unity of the Spirit and in the bond of peace" to transact their business under the conscious and convicted presence of the prevailing power of God the Holy Ghost. Their business was God's business, and His head partnership was both sought for and consistently recognized. And the result, so sudden and practically unanimous, coming almost as a flash of lightning from the sky, changing the surroundings in practically a moment of time, illuminating the darkness of uncertainty with the broad beams of unpremeditated decision, was abundant evidence that God was present with the chief pastors of His flock and that their trust in Him had not been imposed in vain.

"God works in a mysterious way His wonders to perform." This fact was emphasized anew in the termination of the meeting of bishops in Bethlehem Chapel of Washington Cathedral. Verily, "man proposes, and God disposes." Prognostications were abundantly falsified by what actually happened.

The general public had been led to suppose that this man or that man or the other man would be elected to the highest office in the Church's bestowal, and each man named was a man who would have graced the position of Presiding Bishop; but the man ultimately chosen was a man whose name had not been emblazoned abroad in the list of prospects, a man who has never sought an office in his life, and a man who accepted the honor conferred upon him by his brethren as an opportunity for service unexpected, unheralded, and undesired. Nobody who was present at the executive session of the House of Bishops could

have failed to realize that he was eyewitness to another instance of the Holy Ghost leading the Church into the abodes of truth. The lot fell upon Charles Palmerston Anderson in accordance with the will of God, and our new Presiding Bishop, even as our former Presiding Bishop, is the gift of God to His Bride, the Church. In this recognition we may well take courage and look forward into the future without anxiety or fear.

The meeting of the House of Bishops was preceded by the celebration of the Holy Communion in the Bethlehem Chapel at 9:30 A. M. The Bishop of Ohio, the Senior Bishop, was the celebrant, and he was assisted by the Bishops of Chicago, South Dakota, and Washington. At the conclusion of the service the House of Bishops was called to order and went into executive session. The facts that issued from the meeting for the information of the Church at large were: The election of the Rev. S. Harrington Littell, S.T.D., as Bishop of Honolulu, and the election of the Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson, D.D., Bishop of Chicago, as Presiding Bishop of the Church. Everything else that transpired at the meeting, and there was much that would have been of edification to the General Church, is hidden under the veil of secrecy, and it would be a violation of confidence to divulge the same. It is permissible, however, to record the appointment of the Bishop of South Dakota, the Rt. Rev. Hugh L. Burleson, D.D., as Assessor to the Presiding Bishop. Bishop Burleson will thus continue to serve the Church in this capacity as he so ably served the Church under the late Presiding Bishop and during the brief régime of the Senior Bishop, the Bishop of Ohio.

The setting of this special meeting of the House of Bishops was inspiring to a degree. The serene beauty of Bethlehem Chapel, behind the altar of which lies the body of Henry Yates Satterlee, the first Bishop of Washington, and along the nave of which are the tombs of Woodrow Wilson, the War President of the United States, and Admiral Dewey, the hero of Manila Bay, evoked thoughts and sentiments that blended harmoniously with the dignity and solemnity of the occasion. The historic dead seemed to raise their challenge to the apostles of the living present to "carry on and carry through." God grant that it may be so, that the parting words of Bishop Murray to his Church may bear fruit an hundredfold. "The King is dead, long live the King!" The chain continues, the apostolic succession is verified in fact.

The only other business transacted was the formal presentation to the House of two new Bishops: the Rt. Rev. Frank E. Wilson, D.D., Bishop of Eau Claire; and the Rt. Rev. Francis M. Taitt, D.D., Bishop Coadjutor of Pennsylvania.

Fifteen Bishops Nominated

Our special correspondent, being himself a member of the House of Bishops, has most scrupulously observed the confidential character of the executive session of that body. Certain additional facts have been revealed in the daily papers, however, and we draw upon the New York *Times* for the following supplementary account:

After seven hours of balloting, says the *Times*, the House of Bishops elected the Rt. Rev. Charles Palmerston Anderson, Bishop of Chicago, to be Presiding Bishop, seventy of ninety-three votes being cast for him on the sixteenth ballot.

Bishop Anderson's election resulted from a coming together of the leaders of the House representing the various bishops whose names had been placed in nomination. It was made unanimous amid the singing of the doxology.

He succeeds Bishop John Gardner Murray, who died suddenly before the altar of St. James' Church in Atlantic City in October, during the meeting of the House of Bishops which elected Bishop Anderson as vice-chairman.

Bishop Anderson presided at the meeting which elected him to fill out the two years of Bishop Murray's unexpired term and filled the vacancy in the missionary field created by the death of Bishop James La Mothe of Honolulu.

The latter office was filled by the election, on the third ballot, of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Harrington Littell of Wilmington, Del., whose life work in the Church has been as a missionary in China and who is now in Hankow.

The first three ballots were taken alternately, the bishops voting for a missionary bishop while the count proceeded on the previous ballot for Presiding Bishop. Only the final result was announced, and all votes were destroyed after each ballot. Without intermission other than a brief half hour for luncheon, the balloting for Presiding Bishop proceeded throughout the afternoon, the fourth ballot being taken when the bishops reconvened at 1:30 o'clock.

Of the fifteen bishops who were placed in nomination, the choice quickly narrowed down to three, Bishop Ernst L. Stires of Long Island, Bishop James E. Freeman of Washington, and Bishop Hugh L. Burleson of South Dakota. Bishop Thomas F. Gailor of Tennessee and Bishop James De Wolf Perry of Rhode Island were prominent in all the ballots, and Bishop Burleson, who, as Assessor to Bishop Murray, was regarded as well qualified for the post, remained up to the last ballot one of the leaders. Another was Bishop Henry St. George Tucker of Virginia.

Others who were voted for during the almost continue balloting were Bishop Philip Cook of Delaware, Bishop Edward L. Parsons of California, and Bishop Paul Matthews of New Jersey.

Ninety-four bishops were in attendance, and a vote of sixty-eight was necessary to elect. At 6 o'clock Bishop Lawrence was obliged to return to his home. After the twelfth ballot, shortly after that hour, the bishops voted down motions to adjourn until tomorrow, or even until 8 o'clock. The end came shortly before 7 o'clock, when, fifteen ballots having failed to elect any one of the bishops nominated, Bishop Anderson was placed in nomination and elected.

Immediately following his election Bishop Anderson designated Bishop Hugh L. Burleson of South Dakota as his assistant, and the designation was immediately confirmed by the House of Bishops.

Taken by surprise at the new honor and responsibility conferred upon him, Bishop Anderson said that he had no plans, having had time to make none.

"I will, of course, give the best work I can to the Church in all its ramifications," he said.

"I shall be in New York much of the time, but will keep my home in Chicago, and will not resign the Chicago diocese."

He repeated what he said last year, that he believed the Church should keep out of politics.

"Get religion into politics," he said, "but get politics out of religion. There is, of course, no sphere of human contact from which a man can detach his religion; religion should go with us into everything, but that does not mean that the Church should go into everything, especially politics, or meddle with it."

He had tried, he said, to be "an apostle of peace," and spoke of a sermon he had recently preached on that theme.

In electing Bishop Anderson, the House of Bishops followed the same precedent as to age it did when four years ago in New Orleans it named Bishop Murray. In both cases the House chose one of the older bishops. Bishop Anderson is 66 years old. He has been head of the Chicago diocese twenty-nine years.

In 1919 Bishop Anderson, as president of the commission of the World Conference of Faith and Order, together with two other bishops and two clergymen, had an audience with the late Pope Benedict V, at which they asked the Pontiff to let the Roman Catholic Church take part in the conference which later was held in Lausanne, Switzerland.

The Pope did not comply with the request and all Christian faiths were represented at Lausanne except the Roman Catholic.

Bishop Anderson was born at Kemptville, Ont., not far from Ottawa. He was educated at Trinity College School, Port Hope, and the University of Trinity College, Toronto. He was ordained in Christ Church, now the Cathedral, at Ottawa, and a year later was advanced to the priesthood. His first duties as a priest were at Beachburg, Ont., where his work grew so as to require the aid of three clergymen. He married Miss Janet Glass of Belleville, Ontario, September 14, 1889.

In May, 1901, Dr. Anderson was called to Grace Church, Oak Park, Chicago. He built a new edifice for this congregation. He was elected Bishop Coadjutor of Chicago at a special convention held at the cathedral in Chicago, January 9, 1900. On the death of Bishop William Edward McLaren, February 19, 1905, he became Bishop of the diocese.

The new Presiding Bishop is the author of a number of devotional books, including *Letters to Laymen*, issued in 1914; *The Religion of Our Lord*, 1923; *Religion and Morality*, in 1924; and *Twentieth Century Discipleship*, 1928.

The Rev. S. Harrington Littell, S.T.D., Bishop-elect of Honolulu, is a native of Wilmington, Del., and has been a missionary in China since 1898. Dr. Littell has recently returned to Hankow, where he is president of the diocesan council of advice.

O'Connell and Einstein

Is our newspaper press completely dominated by the Roman Church? Some weeks ago, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the great Einstein, Cardinal O'Connell, of Boston, came out with an attack upon this scientist which was unparalleled for sheer ignorance and insult. Not content with attacking the validity of Einstein's discoveries, about which he jovially confessed that he knew nothing, the Roman primate went on to impugn Einstein's motives by suggesting that he was deliberately trying to corrupt the minds of modern youth by teaching atheism. (The same charge, by the way, that was once brought against a man by the name of Socrates!) So absurd was this attack, so utterly and beautifully preposterous, that we waited with eager glee for the avalanche of newspaper ridicule which we felt sure would descend upon the Cardinal's head. But nothing happened. Silence was everywhere. Had it not been for a courageous reply by Mr. Louis Marshall, at the great anniversary meeting in the Metropolitan Opera House, New York, the Cardinal's remarks would have gone altogether unchallenged. Then we thought ourselves! Suppose—as was cogently suggested to us by a friend—suppose that Dr. John Roach Straton had made this silly and vicious attack upon Professor Einstein. Suppose that Calvary Baptist Church, instead of the Boston Roman Catholic Cathedral, had been the scene of this absurd revelation of stupidity and venom. How would the newspapers have exploded with derisive mirth! Double columns and two-inch headlines would have been inadequate to carry the editorial flood of ridicule which would have been poured out upon the unhappy fundamentalist. Is it not a fair question—do our newspapers play fair? Why should a Roman Catholic priest be able to get away with anything, and a Protestant pastor with nothing? Fat-headedness is fat-headedness, no matter whose the head—and we believe it should be so treated in the public prints. —*Unity.*

Book Review

NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*
(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)

The Genesis of the Social Gospel. The Meaning of the Ideals of Jesus in the Light of their Antecedents by *Chester Charlton McCown*, D.D., Ph.D., Professor of New Testament Literature in Pacific School of Religion. Alfred A. Knopf, Publisher, New York, 1929. 394 pages.

"The center and soul of Christianity are to be found in the life and teachings of Jesus. The significance of his attitude on morality and religion is widely acknowledged. In order to learn what the intention of Jesus was with regard to society, and, indeed, in order to discover whether he had a social purpose and outlook, it is necessary to consider, not so much his views on the relations of individuals within their groups, as his conceptions of the economic and political structure of the social organization in general—conceptions not directly stated, but implied in his recorded work and actions. This book has been restricted in the main to conceptions of justice and righteousness in the relations of the social classes, the rich and the poor, the rulers and the ruled." Thus the writer delineates the scope of his inquiry about the genesis of the Social Gospel of Jesus.

Most books about this subject seem satisfied to trace the origin of Jesus' social gospel back to the prophets of the eighth and other centuries. Jesus was in the line of these men of God. He was greater than they, but he had the same zeal for the establishment of the Kingdom—the rule—of God, the same sympathy for the down-trodden, the same faith in God's power to carry out his plans for the redemption of the race.

The author extends his inquiry beyond Israel and its prophets. His fundamental principle is that Judaism in the days of Jesus represented, not the independent evolution of an isolated national group, but a syncretism of all the ancient civilizations which centered about the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea. He includes in his study, therefore, the social ideals of the Sumerians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Persians and Egyptians and finds in all of their cultures originally the nomadic ideal, emphasizing the simple life and the value of the individual. When men multiplied and passed beyond the simpler nomadic and agricultural types of society, they began to come into competition for places in the sun. A long series of conflicts arose which developed the predatory ideal and, in turn, produced the poor who suffered from the powerful in ancient Babylon, Egypt, and Israel. In protest against this "barbarian" civilization the great ethical religions arose, all about the same time, Buddhism, Confucianism, Zor-

oastrianism, and the prophetic religion of Israel. "The Hebrew religion preserved wonderfully the values of primitive group life, the ideals of the family, fatherhood, brotherhood, service, and love. The Hebrews were able to maintain these ideals because of their peculiar geographic situation and the unusual course of their history." Reviewer doubtless could not consider this explanation adequate, but we let this pass.

The pious poor, the writer goes on, and humble of post-exilic times and later the apocalyptists preserved this ideal and handed on. Jesus took it up and enshrined it in his life and teachings in a form immeasurably superior to its former formulation. He had no sooner done so than, to prove his devotion to his ideal, he died. Within two centuries his followers lost it.

The Pietists of Wesley's time (and those in other countries) and the Fundamentalists of our own day have no social gospel. Nor have the Liberals, even those of the religio-historical school. Troeltsch e. g. says, Christianity was not the result of social movements; it was never directly connected with the social upheavals of ancient society. To be sure, Jesus appealed mainly to the oppressed and to the unimportant people. He regarded wealth as dangerous to the soul. It is true that the church in the beginning actually drew its believers mainly from the lower classes of the cities, but it is also true that the whole of the missionary and edificatory literature of early Christianity, both within and without the New Testament, knows nothing of a fnndamental social problem, that everywhere the problem of the soul's salvation, of monotheism, of life after death, of pure worship, of the proper organization of the community (gemeinde), of the practical testing of the believers, of strict rules of holiness, are the center of interest.

Our author believes that there is a social gospel in Jesus' teaching. To be sure, Jesus was not a Socialist, who thinks that the redemption of the race is dependent on a political or economic program. Nor was he a Communist, who aims at world betterment by a revolutionary rising of the proletariat. Jesus decidedly never thought that the Kingdom would be built by putting the ballot in every citizen's hand. He stressed spiritual change, the powers of faith and love. Not a mystic faith and love, though, but an active, sacrificial love that shrinks at nothing in the service of God and humanity. The church has been studying the gospel of Jesus now for some time from the view-point of its social implications, without having gone very far in constructive results along this line. The coming of the Kingdom does involve the working of divine influences on men. But God works according to law and he leaves it to men to discover his laws. We ought to be able to discover and apply the laws of social growth and control. We ought to be able to discover how to bring the reign of God to earth. The process will be a long one, for the task is gigantic—a spiritual as well as a social task. But with God all things are possible.

The author has done a vast work along his special line—the study

of the "antecedents" of the Social Gospel of Jesus. But when he comes to the Social Gospel itself, we don't see that he has carried us very much further beyond the position we held before (general principles, but no concrete program).

The Renaissance of Jesus, by *Geo. T. Tolson* (Professor of the History of Christianity, Pacific School of Religion.) The Abingdon Press, 1929. 269 pages, $2.00.

This book is of great interest because of the comprehensive historical sweep of its discussion. It takes the conception of Jesus—the central aspect of the Christian religion—and shows how it has changed with the changing intellectual and social environment of the times. It may be said, therefore, that it contains a *brief history of the Christology of the church.* It is the thesis of the author that Jesus was largely misunderstood by the preceding ages and that only the critical bible study of the last 150 years has freed the original character and mission of Jesus from all kinds of faulty accretions and gives us the Jesus as he really was. To use a phrase often employed in recent writings, it has substituted for the religion *about* Jesus the religion *of* Jesus.

Jesus was too great for even his early interpreters, the writer thinks. Even the Synoptics, who otherwise come closest to the truth, are not altogether to be trusted. Parables like that of the cursing of the fig tree; Jesus' word about indiscriminate giving; the extreme statement about the danger of riches; the terrible woes on the Pharisees (Matt. 23), and many other like sayings and incidents, must therefore be questioned. The fourth evangelist, or whoever wrote the fourth gospel, does not give an historical portrait of Jesus, he gives us a meditation about Jesus as the principle of the true life, which was greatly affected by Philonian philosophy. We find in it an undue self-exaltation in the humble Nazarene and exaggerated statements about his person and power.

The same abatements have to be made in the teachings of Paul. Jesus was the founder of the Christian religion, Paul the founder of Christianity, i. e. of the universal church and its theology. The fall of Adam and its consequences, the Oriental dualism between flesh and spirit, the idea of an atonement effected by a substitutionary sacrifice, Christ's pre-existence and his role as world creator—all these teachings are contributions of Paul and not in harmony with Christ's idea about himself. The church, unfortunately, followed Paul more than it did Jesus. Like him, it borrowed from contemporary pagan thought. The early apologists (Clement, Justin, etc.) "created their theology out of Greek philosophy, and then proved it from Greek philosophy." Take the case of the heathen mystery religions: the fourth gospel is surcharged with their influence and Paul by no means escaped it. We see the effect in the redemption theories of these biblical writers and in their exaggerated mystical ideas of the sacraments. The Roman church is dominated by the governmental conception. The "Latins have taken the religion of Jesus from the beautiful intimacies of the

family and placed it in the formalities of the Roman court." The church became the intermediary between the divine autocrat and sinful humanity.

The Protestant Reformation has recovered for us some of the privileges of original Christianity. It laid the foundation for the spiritual emancipation of the individual. But still, its theology remained largely traditional. Paul and his justification by faith is in the center, not the simple gospel of the Jesus of the Synoptics and his "way of life." J. Wesley although he wisely contended that Christianity was not a matter of opinion, did not differ from the traditional theology of Protestantism. The same applies to the Pietists and all those who put life above doctrine: their doctrines are the old ones, only they put the emphasis on the fruits of the Christian life, not on the teachings. And their ideas of salvation are cast in the individual mold; they have no social gospel.

Protestant scholasticism is even farther removed from the genius or original Christianity. It is no wonder that it evoked, in protest, not only Pietism but the revolt of Reason, the Enlightenment (Aufklaerung). The author now follows the development of this movement, its influence on science, politics and religion. No doubt there was evil as well as good connected with it. But on the whole the results have been beneficial. The modern critical bible study that it produced has liberated us from the bondage of the letter (verbal inspiration). We understand the bible better because we know more about the times and circumstances under which it was written. We have learned to apply the principles of evolution to the biblical record. There was warfare between science and religion for centuries. Now the gulf between the two is being largely filled. Science has changed from dogmatism to open-mindedness and theology looks to science for new thought-forms and new ways of approach.

The "Back to Jesus" movement has taught us to look upon him not as a necessary part of a plan of salvation through a vicarious theory of atonement, but an example, an incitement to better living, a power for building character. He is an ethical teacher, teaching and exhibiting a new way of life, not one expecting us to accept impossible dogmas or supernatural explanations of things that can well be explained by the investigation of patient scholarship. It is still impossible to demonstrate that there is a god. The way to him is still by faith. But science is ready to admit that there are areas and experiences approachable only by intuition. "If you present Jesus as the way of life it is likely he will be accepted. Jesus is coming into his own." If those in whose hands are the economic and political destinies of our times will incarnate Jesus into their affairs, we are saved. For this consummation the way seems open as never before since the Renaissance period, when the schism between science and religion began." Jesus in his unbounded confidence in God and his unwavering love to man is a challenge to the church, its members, and ministers. His idealism must become the guiding light of the man of affairs. His method—by persuasion, not by violence; his principle—

not self, but service, must become the world's method and principle. "Even so will the Lord Jesus come into the life of the world."

Such, in short, is the reasoning of the writer; thus instructively he sketches the ancient and the modern development of the Jesus-idea. He has faith in the new light, he looks forward optimistically into the future if only world and church will accept and live up to the new Christ and his gospel. We have no such faith, nor any such rosy optimism. The author's idea of Jesus is that of the Modernist.

Modernism arrives at it by employing the methods of critical bible study, calling to aid all the kindred services (history, biology, psychology, sociology). If the church or the individual Christian is to depend for his faith in Jesus on the results or guesses of modern science, they are to be pitied indeed. For scholarship is *by no means agreed* on the question. There are many who, with Bultmann, claim that there is hardly anything we know for sure about Jesus. The author rejoices that we are not bound by the letter but shall have the glorious privilege to get at the kernel of truth by personal discovery. To us there seems to be little ground for such rejoicing. If we have the New Testament in our hands and there is nothing it in about Jesus we are sure about but that he trusted in God and loved his fellow-men, we are indeed in a sorry plight. If the New Testament expert has our faith in his keeping, we are in a most abominable bondage. Tomorrow we may have to give up the most highly prized promise or statement our faith has been resting upon!

We know for sure that those 150 years of bible criticism the author boasts so much about, have in no way made untenable our faith that Jesus is our *Redeemer*, not only an ethical teacher, or example, or inspiration to a "way of life." That John's statements about Jesus are by no means exaggerated even if there are Philonian thought-forms in the logos-idea; that it is no "undue self-exaltation" if he calls himself "the way, the truth, the life," or that "no one comes to the father but by him."

Why are we sure about this fact? Because the New Testament has not yet forfeited its right to be the norm as well as source of our faith, and it teaches essentially the same about Jesus in all its parts; because the church has ever stood by and on this conception of Jesus; and because our own religious experience fully corresponds with this estimate of his person. An emasculated gospel, a deleted faith in Jesus may please him who has no use for the supernatural. It will not, however, be the "mighty fortress and the bulwark never failing" of a struggling church or a hard tried Christian. Nor will it be a challenge to the man of affairs in the economic world in general. If our industrial order is to be changed and the church is to be an essential agency in this change, this church needs a baptism of the Holy Spirit, and this Spirit came upon the church 1900 years ago under the preaching of the crucified and risen Lord: will it be any different in the future?

The Primitive Church. Studied with special reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry by *Canon B. H. Streeter.* The Macmillan Co., 1929. 323 pages, $2.50.

Canon Streeter, by this time well known as the author of important books ("Reality," "The Four Gospels," "The Sadhu") here gives us the lectures delivered (on the Hewett Foundation) at Cambridge, Mass. Being Reader in Christian Origins in the University of Oxford, England, it is only natural that he delves again into the exploration of the Primitive Church. This object, however, is very definitely circumscribed. His researches have nothing directly to do with the life, the doctrines, the worship or the growth of the early church. He deals exclusively with the origin of the Christian ministry; more generally, with the type of Church Order in the primitive church. His conclusions are that in the New Testament there can be traced an evolution in Church Order. At the end of the first century there existed in different provinces of the Roman empire, different systems of church government. Among these, the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, and the Independent, can each discover the prototype of the system to which he himself adheres.

The sources which are available for this study are the New Testament and the early Apostolic Fathers. The church history of Eusebius (around A. D. 300), although containing much legendary material, the author also rates very highly. The heresies (Gnostic and others) which sprang up early made it necessary for the church to decide which of the sacred writings were genuine, i.e. apostolic and deserving of general acceptance, and which were not. So the Canon of the New Testament came to be fixed at an early time. Those writings that were in harmony with the apostolic faith, or with the faith of the ecumenical church, survived; the others perished or could only be reconstructed out of the quotations found in the early apologists. As a result the early history of the church is far less obscure than that of other religions, e. g. of Buddhism.

In the Jerusalem church Christians would naturally organize themselves as a synagogue—with the normal body of presbyters. At an early date deacons were appointed. In the churches founded by St. Paul the terms episkopoi and presbyters are applied to the same person. In John 3 the writer finds in Diotrephes the first monarchical bishop in that church.

In Syria (Antioch) we learn from the Didache that bishops and deacons were regarded as officials deserving high respect. The didache marks the stage when the system in which prophets and teachers were the regular leaders of the churches is breaking down and gradually being replaced by a "regular" ministry of bishops and deacons. The epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (A. D. 96) exercised enormous influence on the East, more especially in Syria. Ignatius salutes the Roman Christians as "the instructors of others." He champions the hierarchical system, which was at that time of recent origin at Antioch.

There were several reasons why Rome became the central author-

ity. First, Peter and Paul were supposed to have died there as martyrs. The political influence of Rome played a great part in enhancing the position of the Roman church. The lists of early bishops of Rome in Irenaeus and Epiphanius probably go back to one drawn up by Hegesippus, who visited Rome A. D. 165. Strictly speaking neither Peter nor Paul founded the church in Rome.

Mon-episcopacy (monarchical ep.) did not exist in Rome at the time of the epistle of Clement. But the principle of apostolical succession as the basis of authority is affirmed. Immense stress is laid on discipline and the duty of obedience. Evidence that as late as Irenaeus the Bishop of Rome was still entitled "presbyter" is at hand. By A. D. 115 the position of the President of the elders had grown in importance. The arrival of Ignatius, with his impassioned advocacy of the predominance of the bishop, had a great effect on the local situation in Rome. The fervor of Ignatius gave Rome a line of bishops ready later on to make a greater claim upon the Keys. With the death of the apostles and the destruction of Jerusalem the Church lost its natural center and the decision of important questions was left in the hands of the churches of the greater capitals (Rome, Antioch, Alexandria). This explains the exceptional authority accorded the patriarchs of these capitals, which became especially noticeable at Alexandria.

The final results of the author's research are: In the Primitive Church there was no single system of Church Order laid down by the apostles. During the first hundred years of Christianity, the church was an organism alive and growing—changing its organization to meet changing needs. Uniformity was a later development; and for those times it was, perhaps, a necessary development.

"The greatest obstacle to church union to-day is the belief that there is some one form of Church Order which alone is primitive; and which, therefore, alone possesses the sanction of Apostolic precedent. Our review of the historical evidence has shown this belief to be an illusion. It may be that the line of advance for the Church of today is not to imitate the forms, but to recapture the Spirit, and of the Primitive Church."

Like all of Streeter's writings, the book is written in a vivid style and non-technical language. The subject—origins of the Church Order —might be less interesting to us than it would be to an Episcopalian or to one trying to defeat the Episcopalian claim to Apostolical succession. The later finds in Streeter—himself an Episcopalian—nearly all the ammunition he needs.

Jesus on Christianity. A study in Contrasts by *Kirby Page*, Editor, "The World To-morrow." Doubleday, Doran and Co. 1929. 326 pages.

This volume points out the divergencies between the religion of Jesus and organized Christianity. The purpose of Jesus was to build the Family of God, where all members of society dwell in right relations with the Father and with each other. Christianity in its his-

torical development has accumulated so many alien and hostile elements as to make it a different religion from the simple faith of its founder. To Jesus God was a Father. The God of Jesus differs fundamentally from the Jehovah presented in many sections of the Old Testament. Jehovah is a God of war throughout most of the Old Testament material. With Jesus God is the Father of all and the affections of the home ought to be cultivated by, and towards, all members of the family, regardless of race, wealth, culture.

The cross was the climax of Christ's God-revealing life. It teaches the redeeming power of sacrificial love, the appalling need of the human heart (the desperate wickedness of sin). It produces repentance and so makes it possible for God to "save" us, i. e. to make out of us men with the spirit of Jesus.

In a historical survey the author seeks to show the causes of the rapid extension of early Christianity (the conviction Jesus had risen; a gospel of salvation in a decaying world; the practice of love; heroism in the face of death, etc.) But soon after the recognition of Christianity as the religion of the empire alien elements creep in: the glorification of war, theological controversies, the use of violence towards those of dissenting faith; immorality of the clergy, superstition and magic; feudalism, the divine right of kings, class consciousness with pride and oppression.

The author then goes on to contrast contemporary Christianity with the religion of Jesus. Interesting reminiscences from the World War are presented (Lyman Abbott, who called upon the Allied armies the blessing of the "Peacemaker," Matt. 5; W. Sunday and his notorious prayer against the Huns; Dr. Hillis, who demanded the "sterilization of the ten millions of German soldiers and the segregation of their women so as to rid the body of society of the awful cancer of the German race"!!! And there are still many post-war endorsements of armed preparedness by Christian clergymen and laymen. The Fundamentalists are apparently the most outspoken defenders of the war system: "National killing is approved by Scripture." The writer goes on in his denunciation of other denials of the spirit of Christ as manifested in capital punishment, racial discrimination, economic injustice and ecclesiasticism.

In his last chapter he asks the question: Is the religion of Jesus practicable? and answers, yes, if our good will is intelligent; if we create adequate social organizations; if we abandon the doctrine that the end justifies the means; if we are willing to take the consequences, and if we discover and utilize spiritual resources. This last point, the necessity and the method of strengthening spiritual strength and vision is especially worth reading.

We have given little more than the headings of the chapters and sections of the book. With most of the author's views we agree. He is a Liberal in theology; he puts strong emphasis on the ethical conduct, the Christian spirit rather than on creed and orthodoxy. His ideals are high and his moral demands exacting. Here we are at one with him even if we can't adopt his theology.

Worship in Music, by Edwin Holt Hughes, Robert C. McCutchan, Peter Christian Lutkins, Earl Enyeart Harper, Carl F. Price, Karl P. Harrington, John M. Walkes. The Abingdon Press, 1929. 204 pages, $1.50.

The important place of music in the service of the church is being more and more recognized. That the sanctuary ought to be a place of beauty and envelop the congregation in an atmosphere of reverence; that its architecture and appointments as well as the deportment of minister, choir and people all ought to serve the purpose of making it a house of religious devotion: these things receive added emphasis year after year. It stands to reason that the kind of music people sing and choirs render ought to be in harmony with these ideals, which had long been forgotten but are now impressed on the minds not only of the members of literugical churches, but of all.

This book, containing the eleventh series of the Mendenhall Lectures, delivered at De Pauw University, deals with such subjects, the purpose of the lectures being to emphasize again the importance of music as an element in divine worship, and to exemplify the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures through music. The first three lectures are by Bishop Hughes. He shows how music and religion have always been joined together. Particularly in our religion, from the time when Miriam, after passing the Red Sea, burst out in the first recorded song of redemption, "Sing unto the Lord for he has triumphed gloriously," until the time when the final state of the glorified will be in the atmosphere of music. Creation, Redemption, Glorification have been the great themes of Christian song. The whole story of the bible, it may be said, is set to music. There ever was a new song for a new experience. Israel learned to sing "the Lord's song," whether in a foreign land where harps were hanging upon the willows, or in its own borders when all the instruments of music were brought forth for the accompaniment of praise. "Music that holds the deep religious appeal transcends all boundaries and claims dominion all around the planet."

When you pass into the New Testament it becomes quickly vocal with music. It may rightly be said that Christ is "the singing master of the centuries." Christianity is a singing religion. If a large part of religion is emotional, it finds its expression in music. All great religious periods have produced new harvests of hymns, the best of which will not die.

It is impossible to dwell on all the good things Bishop Hughes says in the three lectures that form the beginning of the book. Other subjects, treated by other writers, are: Hymns and Public Worship; The Order of Worship; Some New Anthems; Choir-masters and their Choirs; The Music Committee. All articles are from experts in their lines.

The book is bound to give helpful information on all the timely matters it deals with. If—as we do not doubt—all the chapters are up to the three written by the bishop, which we have read, it is a volume we most heartily commend to our readers.

What Lutherans Believe. An exposition of Luther's catechism presented in a brief series of popular lectures for the instruction of adults by *W. E. Schramm.* The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. 156 pages, 75 cents.

Lutherans are said to indoctrinate their members more carefully than any other Protestant denomination. They do this in their parochial schools; their catechism classes; their preaching, which still puts heavy emphasis on doctrinal sermons; and in books like the one under review.

The author follows the catechism through its five chapters. The teachings of the ten commandments are expounded in a simple, popular style. Then the creed is taken up. First, though, the bible is treated as the source of all our faith, it is the supreme authority in all spiritual matters.

Of course, most other Christian bodies have the same faith in it. But here the claim is made that the doctrines of the bible's 66 books are in absolute agreement. The Lutherans, therefore, do not accept the view that the bible is the record of a gradual self-revelation of God; that in the knowledge of God as well as in the ethical teachings there is a progress from crude and imperfect conceptions to higher and more exalted ones.

The book condemns the theory of evolution as not only false but pernicious also. This theory gives no clue to the origin of matter, of life, or moral consciousness, etc. It attacks the bible. It excludes the supernatural and is in no way to be harmonized with the Word of God. To accept the teachings of Darwin and his followers requires more credulity than to accept the simple statement of holy writ. The book closes with the sacraments. According to it the infant receiving baptism is born again. A strong plea is made for the claim that baptism of infants has a scriptural basis ("baptize the nations": children are part of the nation). Also for the mode of sprinkling: baptism does not mean immersion only, but also just "washing."

The Lord's Supper is explained in the Lutheran way i. e. in, with and under the elements we receive the body and blood of Christ.

As a popular interpretation of the teachings of Luther's Small Catechism the book is well fitted to serve the reader. It makes no concession to modernism—which could hardly be expected—but is mild and quiet in tone. The "rabies theologorum" is entirely absent, as far as we have seen.

The Happy Family, by *L. H. Schuh,* Ph.D., D.D. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. 203 pages, $1.25.

From sermons preached by the author this book has been prepared as a guide in the life of the family. There are many books on this subject. The present one, though, stresses God as the author of marriage and lifts marriage out of the level of a mere human arrangement. The chapters have the following headings: The Basis of a Happy Marriage; Companionate Marriage; A Cradle for a Car; Your Wife or Your Mother; Better Parents; Christ as a Lawyer; etc.

Watermarks in the Gospel, by *Will. Schoeler.* Lutheran Book Concern. 123 pages, 50 cents.

The truth of the evangelical narratives are here shown to be borne out by the incidental evidence which they contain. This "unintentional" evidence in the bible is enormous. It is to be found in every book. It proves that the gospel accounts are not forgeries. "Only the uninformed can speak of myths and legends; scholars have begun to tread softly."

For instance, in the story of the temptation, it is pointed out that the Jews had never conceived the idea of the temptation of the Messiah at the beginning of his life. Nowhere in all the Rabbinic writings is there a trace of such a temptation of the expected Redeemer. How, then, does it happen to be recorded by all the Synoptists?

The author goes through the whole life of Christ for such "watermarks" indicating that the account is genuine. In many cases this unintentional evidence presented by the writer is quite strong. If it does not convince the unbeliever, it certainly adds strength to the faith of the one whose heart is already inside the fold.

Under the Banner of the Snow King, by *Wm. Schmidt.* Luth. Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. 361 pages, $1.25.

"An amazing story of love, war and adventure. Rich in historical lore, this novel with its setting in the early seventeenth century, imparts to the reader a wealth of interesting information on the trials endured by the Protestants during the Thirty Years' War, in which Gustavus Adolphus, the "Snow King," played an important role as the defender of the Evangelical cause. The story leads the reader from Germany to Holland and from there to America, where the leading characters settle on the Delaware and distinguish themselves as Christian pioneers, respected everywhere by those they meet."

St. John, one of the disciples whom Jesus loved (John 13: 23). A Series of Exegitical-Homiletical Text Studies on John the Evangelist by *R. C. H. Lenski,* D.D. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. 1928. 194 pages, $1.75.

The well-known author (compare e. g. his book on the "Eisenach Pericopes") gives us here nine text studies on the personality of John, the beloved disciple. The exegetical part of each study is characterized by an unusual thoroughness. Not a single word or phrase is overlooked; he has a very sharp eye for significant touches that escape other commentators. At the same time the exposition is never dry nor does it lose itself in grammatical subtleties. It would be hard in this country to find a preacher who is so loyal to his text and succeeds in bringing out the wealth of its teachings in such surprising fashion.

Among the expository pulpit men Lenski occupies high rank. Each exegetical study is followed by homiletical hints and a number of sermon plans. These plans are fully worked out, so that a sermon

built on them would have a well knit logical unity. The first study, for instance, on John 1: 35-42, offers the following outlines:

1. John's first contact with Jesus.
   1. That contact was divinely meditated (follows explanation).
   2. It made a deep impression.
   It produced an immediate result (fully worked out by the author).
2. "Come and see!"
   1. A gracious invitation.
   2. A veiled promise.
   3. An attractive assurance.
3. How John was started on his high career.
   1. The kindling of spiritual inspiration.
   2. The impress of divine truth.
   3. The blessedness of soul experience.
   4. The awakening of true faith.

The book is a splendid contribution to the problem of learning again the lost art of expository preaching.

The Great Conjecture. Who *is* this Jesus? by *Winifred Kirkland.* Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1929. 132 pages.

The great question that will never die in human history is the question, "What think ye of Christ?" or, as the author puts it, "Who *is* this Jesus?" The answer cannot begin by simply referring to a book or a creed or the church. It must be answered on the basis of personal experience. What has Jesus meant to you, what has been the effect of his personality on yours? Such is the argument of this book, such is the road that the author claims is the only one leading to conviction in this modern age. If that be called the mystical approach she is willing to be called a mystic, but a mystic standing for rigorous activity, not for sleepy contemplation. She outlines her conception of Jesus Christ in four chapters: the Jesus of History, of Experience, of Adventure, of the Resurrection.

The Jesus of history is presented in the New Testament. We have there the life of Jesus, as described by four different men, a record with many discrepancies but consistent in the delineation of one challenging, commanding, life-changing personality. Over the original picture old Judaism has poured all its ancient conceptions of sacrifice and propitiation. The Church, the inheritor of the old empire, has set him on a high altar and crowns him with an imperial crown; and the mystery cults of old Greece crept into the new religion. To-day, however, he has put from him the old grave clothes of dogma and ritual and of sterile emotion. The critical approach to the bible has enabled us to find our way back to the real Jesus.

Over against the Jesus of history stands the Jesus of experience. To find him, we have to use the methods of modern science. This method is, first, a hypothesis conceived by imagination, then experiment, then conviction. In the Christian religion we start with the hypothesis of a divine man, then use the laboratory experiment of imitation, which leads to conviction. No conception of Jesus casketed

in a creed is final. Jesus walked for 30 years on the conjecture of God as a father. This conjecture was tested by daily experiment until it led to absolute certainty. After this the Creator selected him as his vehicle of revelation with the divine motive of giving us an example on which to pattern our growth. Jesus had the power of creating personalities, in his likeness, of his associates. The Christian faith rests not on physical miracles but on the miracle of a personality and its power of creating like personalities in those who came under his influence.

Jesus' life was one of adventure. He himself made an experiment of a conjecture that seemed utterly at variance with the facts (that of the divine fatherhood). The experiment was subjected to the severest test and round true and dependable. Then he left after him his followers endued with the same victorious faith; and for 2000 years his influence lives on and his example is imitated by generation after generation.

The only witness for Christ that counts to-day is the life of the Christian. The author declares that she will accept no article of faith as believable until she has first proved it livable. Christ's resurrection is to her a fact. The evidence for it are the men who preached it and the transformation in their lives. She does not care for the reality of the resurrection of the body. What she is interested in and what is the challenging fact to her, is that Christ has more power since he left the earth than before. The living argument for the resurrection of Christ to-day is the living Christian. To her Jesus Christ is the realest fact in the universe. To practice the presence of the risen Lord is the core of mysticism, it is the soul of Christianity. The author thinks we are on the threshold of a new desire and demand for Jesus Christ. The church must be extricated from medieval conceptions. The physical miracles ascribed to Christ are in part legendary accretions; besides, science today performs more miracles than Christ ever did ("The pulmotor has achieved greater prodigies than the raising of Jairus' daughter".)

The author writes inspiring words about the presence of the risen Christ in her life. To her it is a challenge, an incitement to nobler living, to action and self-improvement. Although called a mystic, she has nothing to say about the comforting, consoling, quieting effect of that presence. She is a disciple, or, at least, an admirer of H. E. Fosdick; and, like him, she lives in the element of adventure; like him, she rings the changes on the scientific method and its application to religion. Like Fosdick she believes in the decay of all other authority, in the validity of the pragmatic test only. Like Wieman, she is of opinion that "all our most sacred beliefs and programs of action must be held as tentative and experimental."

The church was not built on such a view. The church was built on the witness of Christ's resurrection as a solid fact. The teaching of the apostles was that Christ died for us while we were still sinners; that we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son. We will not discard such teaching as relics of ancient Jewish beliefs. It is very

true that the life must show the efficacy of the faith that is in us. But very few, if any, could find rest of soul and peace of conscience from the degree of Christlikeness they have attained. So the views of the writer may act as a challenge to those whose faith rests on a mere assent to the articles of a creed. They do not shed any light on the way the foundations of Christian life are laid by appropriating him who is made to us righteousness, sanctification and redemption.

Religion in an Age of Science, by *Edwin A. Burtt,* Ph.D., Department of Philosophy, University of Chicago, 1929. 153 pages.

That there is a conflict between religion and science has been the burden of many a book since President White wrote his famous "History of the Warfare between Theology and Science." Some resolve the conflict by saying that religion and science have to do with two different fields, that of faith and that of knowledge, and that each one ought to be left alone in its legitimate sphere. Others have little patience with this attitude. With Draper, they claim that the history of the human intellect shows that man in his infancy lived in the age of faith. Then came doubt and an unsettled state; and now we are in the age of science.

The author of this book seems very much to share this latter view. Science is to him the all-important characteristic of the age. The scientific method, leading from hypothesis through observation and experiment to discovery and verified facts, ought to be adopted in all human activities and endeavor, in religion no less than in the exploration of the world around us. It is true that religion has to do with values that we cannot do without. The scientific inquiry into the realms of knowledge does not give the warmth of feeling, it does not appeal to the emotions in the same way as does religion. Nevertheless science points the way to the highest goal. Its discoveries are to benefit everybody. The mind, in the process of investigation, is entirely free. The results that are achieved are never considered absolute. There is a constant enlargement of the field of knowledge. All discoveries are held as provisional and tentative to give room at once to new light and calling for change and adjustment.

Philosophy and religion ought to adopt the same attitude, in the opinion of the writer. He therefore rejects e. g. idealism. It arises from a deep-seated need in the human mind to feel at home in the universe. It seeks to satisfy the sense of unshakable certainty. Like religion, it wants to secure such an understanding of the universe as will make it an object of love as well as of intellectual contemplation; both seek what men mean when they say "God."

Religion seeks salvation, by which it has meant an eternal at-homeness in the world in indissoluble union with God, who ultimately controls all things in the interest of a loving plan. The philosopher's duty is to face the event without any such moral or religious bias so far as it can possibly be quenched. Religion ought to reform itself from the ground up, to the extent of becoming through and through harmonious with the spirit of science.

"An ideal of perfection can never reside in the past, it can never be fully embodied in anything already achieved. It is quite clear that any ascription of absoluteness to Jesus Christ is inconsistent with the scientific attitude. It cannot be insisted upon that God is uniquely revealed in any particular historic individual. More than that, the existence of God itself cannot be proved to the satisfaction of everybody. A man buffeted about by the cruel winds of fate will find it hard to convince himself of a loving hand and heart back of human life. All we can do in such a case is, by sympathy and support, make his lot a little easier. It is more important to focus sympathetic and intelligent attention upon live, deep-seated present needs of men as they arise than to cling to any emotionally precious deposit of the past. And if the existence of God, his reality, is not vital to religion, many other things, now considered essential, will have to go.

We see from the preceding review, incomplete as it is, that in the writer's view little will be left of religion in this age of science, for the mere attitude of striving for more light in the domain of knowledge and the readiness to give us past conceptions in place of more recent and better ones, may satisfy the scientist but not the religious mind. If we cannot be sure of the existence of God or of the sufficiency of Jesus as God's revealer and of his power to reconstruct human life, the Christian religion will at once collapse; and if the Christian religion is without foundation, what other religion will take its place?

The scientific method applied to religion will never lead to certainty. God will reveal himself to faith alone. Faith is the product of individual experience. It will forever need the light and food of scripture to sustain it, and the experience of the past to make it fit for new experience in the present.